

Original citation:

Milani, Mila. (2016) From Risorgimento to Il Politecnico : impegno and intellectual networks in the Einaudi publishing house, 1945. *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 21 (1). pp. 35-49.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/80023>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* on 8 April 2016, available online:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1354571X.2016.1112063>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

From *Risorgimento* to *Il Politecnico*: *Impegno* and Intellectual Networks in the Einaudi Publishing House, 1945

Mila Milani, University of Reading, UK¹

m.milani@reading.ac.uk

Address:

School of Modern Languages and Cultures

H4.13 Humanities Building, University Road

University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL

UK

This work was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council UK, under grant no.

H5141700

Abstract

The article unveils the (dis)continuities between two post-WWII journals, *Risorgimento* and *Il Politecnico*, both published by Einaudi in 1945. By re-assessing the publishing history of

¹ Current Affiliation: University of Warwick, UK

Risorgimento from a genealogical perspective, the article aims to chart the evolutions of the then current intellectual debate on *impegno*. Specifically, by analysing both the relevant contributors' correspondence and the essays that were published in the journals, the article examines the journals as sites of networking but also tension between different intellectual *habitus*. This will illuminate not only how the two editors-in-chief (Salinari and Vittorini, respectively) took different positions in relation to both the literary field and the PCI (Italian Communist Party), but also the opposition of editorial staffs – based, respectively, in Rome and in Milan – in relation to the publisher Einaudi.

Da *Risorgimento* a *Il Politecnico*: *impegno* e reti intellettuali nella casa editrice Einaudi, 1945

L'articolo indaga i rapporti di (dis)continuità tra due riviste del Secondo dopoguerra, *Risorgimento* e *Il Politecnico*, entrambe pubblicate da Einaudi nel 1945. Ricostruendo la genesi della storia editoriale di *Risorgimento*, l'articolo intende analizzare il dibattito intellettuale che si stava allora sviluppando in merito al concetto di *impegno*. Nello specifico, tramite l'analisi sia della corrispondenza dei redattori sia dei saggi pubblicati in entrambe le riviste, l'articolo esamina queste ultime come reti di contatti ma anche siti di tensioni tra diversi *habitus* intellettuali. In questo modo, sarà possibile chiarire non solo le diverse posizioni prese, sia rispetto al campo letterario sia al PCI (Partito comunista italiano), dai due capo-redattori (Salinari e Vittorini, rispettivamente), ma anche il contrasto tra le due redazioni – con sede, rispettivamente, a Roma e a Milano – in seno alla casa editrice Einaudi.

Keywords

Secondo Risorgimento, PCI, *impegno*, *Il Politecnico*, Einaudi.

Immediately after World War II, the Italian cultural scene experienced an intense publishing fervour. Weekly and monthly journals, though often short-lived, abounded, enlivening the cultural debate with their wide-ranging approaches, and crucially contributing to the identity and political formation of Italian intellectuals, in the transition from the fall of the Fascist regime to the establishment of the Republic. As generalist media, journals are not only a physical space of publication of both essays and literary contributions, but also a social space of both dialogue and tension within the intellectual *field*, as conceived by Bourdieu (1992). The analysis of the microcosm of the journal can thus unveil the relationships, trajectories and planning of specific intellectual groups, offering valuable insights into the publishing and cultural history, in this case of Italy. Drawing on these premises, this article investigates the relationships and contrasts between two Italian journals in the politically crucial months of the spring and fall of 1945: *Risorgimento* (1945), partly neglected by critical literature, and *Il Politecnico* (1945-47), the most renowned journal of the day. The aim is to cast a sharper light on the nuanced modalities, either eclectic or ‘organic’, in which Italian intellectuals shaped, in both journals, the foundational theme of *impegno* (political commitment).

On 15 April 1945, when Italy was not yet entirely free from the Nazi occupation, the Rome-based editorial staff of the Turinese Einaudi started publishing a monthly journal, emblematically entitled *Risorgimento*. Edited by the literary critic Carlo Salinari, with the collaboration of the Communist militant Fabrizio Onofri, the aim of the journal was to ‘work towards the Risorgimento (resurgence) of Italy’, within ‘the cultural domain’ (Risorgimento 1945a, 3). As outlined in the preface to the first issue, the journal rejected the recent Fascist past, aiming to restore the revolutionary spirit typical of the Risorgimento, and fighting the idea of a neutral culture, detached from historical dynamics. In this sense, the editorial staff proposed an active and cross-cultural collaboration with anti-fascist intellectuals, without any sectarianism with regard to political interests. However, the publishing venture did not last

very long; at the end of August 1945, the fifth and last issue of the journal was released, although this same issue announced the forthcoming publication of other issues. One month after that, on 29 September 1945, the same publisher, Einaudi, this time with the contribution of the Milan-based editorial staff, started publishing a brand-new journal, *Il Politecnico*, first weekly and then, from May 1946, monthly, edited by the renowned anti-fascist writer and intellectual Elio Vittorini. As is widely known, *Il Politecnico* conceived of culture not as ‘comforting’, but as proactive towards the needs of contemporary society (Vittorini 1945, 1). Significantly, although the journal wanted to address itself to a specific political group, that of Marxist intellectuals, it nonetheless advocated a dialogue with ‘idealist and Catholic forces’ to give birth to a ‘new culture’ (*ibid.*).

Besides the proximity of these historical dates, the question we need to address is the extent to which this peculiar timing can be seen, not only as the physiological evolution, taking place in just a few months, of the publishing plans of Einaudi, but, more relevantly, as the symbol of the profound change in terms of conceiving the relationships between intellectuals, culture, and politics, which occurred immediately after WWII. Was the suspension of *Risorgimento* a strictly publishing failure or did the same evolution of *Risorgimento* sow the seeds of the different formulations of the so-called *fronte della cultura* (Cultural Front) which would eventually lead to the publication of *Il Politecnico*? This calls for critical analysis of the diverse intellectual roles and cultural perspectives of the two journals, their organizations and the *habitus* of the two editorial staffs, Milan and Rome-based, respectively, within the same publishing house.

To this end, the article interweaves scrutiny of the published and unpublished archival materials, held at the Einaudi archive (Archivio di Stato, Turin), with analysis of the published contributions (either cultural or more strictly literary) of *Risorgimento*. This will allow us to re-assess the hindrances experienced by Italian left-wing and liberal intellectuals

in establishing a common front. From this perspective, the demise of *Risorgimento* will thus appear not only as the end of an ephemeral venture to the benefit of new, more innovative, and *relatively* more solid publishing ventures, but as a strategic juxtaposition between orthodox and more dynamic conceptions of *impegno*.

Risorgimento: Plans and Troubles in Establishing a fronte della cultura

The scrutiny of archival materials allows to slightly anticipate the initial planning of *Risorgimento* to before April 1945, and to move the actual suspension slightly further on than August 1945. This brings into greater focus the limits of the coalition of anti-fascist intellectual networks that the journal pursued in its ‘manifesto’. If *Risorgimento* intended to represent a ‘cultural agent of an open and progressive society’ (*Risorgimento* 1945, 4), it lacked the crucial features not only for a truly innovative cultural product, but also for an actual move towards a wide-ranging political horizon, as demanded by several institutions.

The emblematic title of ‘*Risorgimento*’ immediately inserts the journal within what Traniello (1997, 22) defined as ‘one of the main axes of the then current political debate’, that is the question of the ‘Secondo Risorgimento’ (for its historical problematization see at least Bendiscioli 1974; and especially Pavone 1995). As Buchignani (2013, 42) reminds us, the myth of the betrayed nineteenth-century *Risorgimento* legitimised those who, at later stages, planned to eventually accomplish it, as had happened with Fascism, Gobetti’s ‘azionismo’ and with the Communist party. In the aftermath of WWII, the idea of a nation that, torn apart by the Fascist regime, had now to rise again prompted the re-evaluation of national history in order to re-establish a sense of national identity. The theme of the ‘Secondo Risorgimento’ was thus strategic for the members of the PCI, as protagonists of the Resistance movement, not only to balance their image in a patriotic way (see Baioni [2003, 190]), but more crucially to overcome the ideological fractures of the anti-fascist parties (see Galli della Loggia and

Roche [2008, 71]). This was explicit in the cautious and collaborative political line taken by the PCI leader Palmiro Togliatti in 1945 (see De Michele [2010, 38]), and in his plan to re-join the party's two centres of Rome and Milan into one single political direction (see Martinelli [1995, 10]).

More precisely, in its "Programma per il lavoro degli intellettuali" (Plan for the work of intellectuals) (Vittoria 2006, 1334-1335), the PCI identified in *Risorgimento* a functional means to establish what, in the months to follow, would be called *Fronte della cultura*. The PCI's project mirrored that of the publisher of the journal, Giulio Einaudi, who, in a newsletter sent to all the potential journal contributors, on 25 January 1945, reaffirmed that *Risorgimento* 'aimed to encourage the collaboration of all men of culture that, without distinction of political faith, can be sure of sharing this new and open perspective' (Mangoni 1999, 193, my translation).

From the very beginning of 1945, the Rome-based collaborators of the publishing house Einaudi strove to establish a diverse and rich network of contacts, which would contribute to the success of the journal. For *Risorgimento*, which they planned to release in the first months of 1945, they sought lively and short articles, discussing historically contiguous matters, focused mainly on the value of the Resistance movement, which was 'part and parcel of the Secondo Risorgimento' (Pavone 1995, 50), as well as offering critical perspectives on the First Risorgimento. The Resistance movement rose as a symbol of the actual fracture with the Fascist past, thus becoming the main topic of both memoirs and essays. The historical interest intertwined with the increasingly obvious, and perhaps not entirely intentional, involvement of renowned and prominent figures, not only of contemporary culture and widely interpreted left-wing political forces, but more specifically of the PCI's *entourage*. The Rome-based editorial staff of *Risorgimento* (including, in addition to the aforementioned Salinari and Onofri, Franco Rodano, member of the *Partito*

della Sinistra Cristiana (Christian left party) and then collaborator of Togliatti), constantly demonstrated difficulties associated with finding collaborators outside the Rome-based networks of the PCI, thus confirming an ‘ideological trend that would become progressively dominant’ (Mangoni 1999, 196). However, at the very beginning, *Risorgimento* did seek cross-party collaboration. As illustrative of this, on 2 January 1945, the journal’s editorial staff wrote to Togliatti’s personal assistant, Massimo Caprara, to ask for a contribution focused on the Resistance Literary Movement in France.¹ A few days later, on 5 January 1945, the proposal for a contribution concerning the anti-fascist intellectuals who had fled Italy and settled in England reached Umberto Calosso, soon to be Socialist member of the Constituent Assembly. More interestingly, the letter did not only ask for an essay but for a systematic collaboration, through Calosso, with Giuseppe Saragat, at the time a member of the Italian Socialist Party, who had been Minister without Portfolio during the Bonomi II government until 10 December 1944. Saragat was invited to join the weekly editorial meetings of *Risorgimento*, thus calling for a formal alliance with Socialist forces.² As was made clear in a letter to the music critic Fedele D’Amico, *Risorgimento* had its foundations in the earlier alliance of left-wing writers, now Association of Italian Culture,³ and, arising from these intellectual networks, it moved towards the involvement of other renowned cultural figures. This was also the PCI’s intent in a sensitive political phase, which needed a cautious and more open stance towards other political forces. In similar terms, a letter sent to Elio Vittorini on 25 May 1945, and presumably written by Salinari, illustrated the geo-cultural difference between Rome and Milan, implicitly referring to the journal’s closeness of the Rome-based editorial staff to the then current guidelines of Palmiro Togliatti. This led to the need ‘to adopt a slightly vague character, if it want[ed] to keep its editorial line and not become a party journal’ (Mangoni 1999, 217). This clearly highlights the distance from the

cautious project of *Risorgimento* and the more disruptive *Il Politecnico*, with its initial and openly stated alliance with the PCI.

The analysis of published essays in *Risorgimento* indicates that, beyond the articles written by politicians, literary critics and intellectuals (such as Guido Calogero, Carlo Dionisotti, Emilio Lussu, Luigi Salvatorelli and Luigi Sturzo), the contributions of intellectuals closer to the PCI, such as Delio Cantimori, Antonio Giolitti, Lucio Lombardo Radice, Gastone Manacorda, Franco Rodano, Natalino Sapegno and Gaetano Trombatore, and the editors Onofri and Salinari, were more numerous and systematic. Significantly, the journal published an essay by Togliatti, aiming to legitimise his own role in the Spanish Civil War. Future collaborators were to have been other PCI members and Einaudi collaborators, such as Mario Alicata, Felice Balbo, Cesare Luporini, Antonello Trombadori, and Elio Vittorini himself (see Vittoria [2006, 1148]). The difficulty in sourcing articles outside these political and intellectual networks, if evident from the very beginning, became increasingly great, the reasons for which were several. On the distribution and network level, one needs to highlight the editorial staff's supposed inability to attract collaborators from outside the Roman *entourage*, drawing on their own – in Bourdieusian terms – symbolic capital, and the structural weaknesses with regard to the journal's circulation. On the more cultural and political level, as will be outlined in the following pages, attention needs to be paid to the unappealing format of the journal, the publishers' change of focus and resources towards *Il Politecnico*, and the disintegration of the anti-fascist alliance project based upon the idea of the Action Party.

Most of the essays and articles came only from Rome-based contributors as the editors appeared unable to extend their influence any further by drawing on their own symbolic capital within the political or cultural fields. Several requests for collaboration outside the Roman nucleus of the Einaudi editorial staff failed. For instance, the attempt to

establish a more profitable and systematic relationship with the Florentine cultural milieu came to nothing. On several occasions Franco Calamandrei – about to become a collaborator with Vittorini's *Il Politecnico*, and son of Piero, among the founders of the Action Party and the Florentine political journal *Il Ponte* – was asked to urge the renowned Florentine writer Vasco Pratolini to send a report on Milanese cultural life, since it 'had been promised more than two months ago' to *Risorgimento*, but never arrived.⁴ The editorial staff repeatedly asked the then mayor of Turin, the anti-fascist and Union member Giovanni Roveda, to send an article on antifascism and the Unions' organization, without receiving any answer.⁵ The same happened in the case of the collaboration, advocated by Mario Alicata, with Guido Dorso, historian and member of the Action Party, who refused due to his commitments as an editor of the journal *L'azione*. The contributions of anti-fascist intellectuals, within a non-strictly Communist horizon, became less and less frequent, thus signalling, we could speculate, a possible ideological resistance to collaboration with Salinari and Onofri, who were being increasingly and systematically included in the party organization of the PCI. The progressive move of the Einaudi publishing house towards the Communist Party also strengthened the ideological connotation of *Risorgimento*. Furthermore, if compared to that of Vittorini,⁶ the status of Carlo Salinari within the 1945 literary field was nearly non-existent: an honoured partisan, he had just started his academic career after graduating in 1941, and he would become central both as an official member of the PCI as Director of the Cultural Committee (see Francese [2000]) and as a militant literary critic, who embraced Marxism in opposition to Crocean historicism, only later in the Fifties.

The Einaudi publishing structure was defective, and unable to establish an efficacious cultural 'front'. According to Giulio Einaudi, a 'brotherly agreement among Turin, Milan, and Rome' (Turi 1992, 171-172) should have been put in place, in order to publish three different, but connected, journals in the three cities: the never-published technical journal in

Turin, the soon to be *Il Politecnico* and *Risorgimento* in Rome. However, the three editorial staffs repeatedly failed to communicate, causing organizational disruptions. In August 1945, in a newsletter to the three offices, Einaudi clearly outlined the lack of exchange of the three journals, with ‘*Risorgimento*, published 10 days ago, [...] still missing.’⁷ In June 1945, two months after the first issue of *Risorgimento*, the publisher tried to find a solution by delegating all administrative duties to one single secretary, Angela Zucconi, whereas previously Bianca Garufi, Cesare Pavese’s personal assistant in the Rome-based editorial staff, had been in charge.⁸ Finally, when the fourth issue was released in July 1945, the editors tried to increase the visibility of *Risorgimento*, by asking other contemporary journals, such as the Neapolitan *Aretusa*, run since 1945 by the Einaudi collaborator Carlo Muscetta,⁹ and *Italia libera*, edited by the Marxist historian Paolo Alatri, to publish its outline in order to provide publicity.¹⁰ Therefore, by means of cultural agents – who would join the PCI two years’ later – the editorial staff sought stricter cohesion with the network of anti-fascist journals, to include *Risorgimento* within a wider periodical circulation in order to enhance its potential influence on the intellectual sphere. However, more complex issues remained, leading to the revision of the journal’s original project.

Towards *Il Politecnico*? Reasons for a Revision of *Risorgimento*

Though short-lived, the publishing venture of *Risorgimento* experienced diverse phases in its evolution. If at the beginning the journal was broadly aimed at anti-fascist intellectuals, for structural reasons, this formula did not succeed, and after the release of two issues, the editors considered several options, on both a typographical and a literary level, in order to revise it. At the beginning of September 1945, the philosopher and politician, Guido Calogero complained to Giulio Einaudi with regard to the typographical use of ‘the very mundane and

too popular'¹¹ typographical font that *Risorgimento* had adopted from the publisher Bodoni. Rather than being sterile, this technical remark signals the creative limits of the journal itself. In addition, as also stressed by Vittoria (2006, 1145), *Risorgimento* offered readers a cover that did not stand out, with its 'notebook-size, beige and blue cover with the Einaudi ostrich [the publisher's trademark, editorial note] on it'. This typographical choice was discussed by the journal's editors, in order to find particular features that could clearly distinguish *Risorgimento* from the rest of the publisher's book production. Specifically, as reported in some unpublished excerpts of the minutes of the journal's editorial meeting, held on 6 June 1945, Fabrizio Onofri suggested modifying, 'at least in the spacing' the typographical font type, and asking the painter Renato Guttuso for a cover draft that, if accepted, 'could with no doubt replace the current cover'.¹² From the need to eventually publish the several issues in one unique volume, these typographical changes did not take place, but it is worth stressing that just after the issue of the very first journal, the editors perceived the need for a more appealing and distinctive format.¹³ Certainly in more radical terms, but within the same innovative multi-modal horizon, the graphics would be the strong point of *Il Politecnico* when it was eventually launched in late September 1945. With the original set-up proposed by the well-known graphic designer Albe Steiner, Vittorini's journal would put forward a different relationship between text and image, drawing on avant-garde Soviet designs and using cartoons and balloons (see Stancanelli [2008]).

Moreover, Onofri, together with Salinari, indicated further and more revealing literary features aimed at enhancing the *Risorgimento* project and moving it towards a brand-new conception of the relationship between art and society. First of all, the debate concerned the journal's literary section, in view of its stagnant character and lack of foresight with regard to contemporary literature and culture. The minutes of the aforementioned June editorial meeting revealed that editors advocated a much more rigorous critical approach. Salinari and

the well-known writer, Alberto Moravia, became responsible for the literary review section, whereas Onofri, along with the literary critic, Carlo Dionisotti, reviewed political works. More significantly, the editors called for an alternative relationship and active collaboration with Italian contemporary writers, by means of the establishment of ‘a stable committee’ within the journal’s editorial staff, which aimed to promote ‘articles and short-stories of young and still unknown writers’.¹⁴ However, this willingness to spread the names of literary figures not yet established in the contemporary Italian literary field, which would find in *Il Politecnico*, and particularly in Vittorini (see Zancan [2009]), one of the main promoters, was not completely realized in *Risorgimento*. If, as we have seen in the previous section, the journal focused on the memoirs of members of the recent Resistance movement, the literary contributions did not diverge much from this orientation, resulting usually in the publication of work by ephemeral and not particularly persuasive names. Beyond a few short-stories by Moravia, the journal published a number of short-stories by the partisan, Alfredo Orecchio, and one short-story by the militant, Francesco Jovine. As far as poetry was concerned, *Risorgimento* offered its readers only two recent poems by Umberto Saba, and a few on the topic of the war by the literary critic Antonio Russi. Similarly, the critical perspective on literature brought into greater focus nineteenth-century Italian literature than contemporary trends. In this respect, the editors asked the critic Natalino Sapegno, who had already contributed with an article on Manzoni, to provide *Risorgimento* with an essay on Verga, ‘since he is the most suitable author for our journal’, due to the strict relationship between *verismo* and the First Risorgimento.¹⁵

Significantly absent in *Risorgimento* was foreign literature, apart from the translation of a memoir by the Austrian anti-fascist playwright and writer, Franz Theodor Csokor, whereas translations played a prominent role in the transnational construction of *Il Politecnico*’s identity as a journal. Salinari himself recognized the need for *Risorgimento* to

breathe a more international air, at least in the review section. The editor was fully aware that moving the journal's attention beyond strictly domestic borders would strengthen the symbolic capital of *Risorgimento*, by bestowing a much more substantial critical weight to cultural debates, and by broadening the perspective to consider current trends within Europe. Thus, when Onofri suggested creating a section entitled "books received", limited to bibliographical notes, Salinari agreed with him, while advocating a more critical approach through short reviews of both foreign and Italian magazines. To this end, he suggested actively collaborating with the transnational networks in Rome and with foreign intellectuals and journals, such as 'Utrillo at *Humanité* and the cultural agents at the English, American and Russian embassies'.¹⁶ This is a first clue of that flexible exchange that anticipated the relationship that a few months' later would see *Il Politecnico* and foreign journals such as Jean Paul Sartre's *Les Temps Modernes* as the main actors.

Finally, the editors hoped for a more thorough consideration of economics and architecture, proposing the creation of a 'monthly newsletter on all the major events within the technical fields' (Mangoni 1999, 216n). Drawing on this approach, according to Onofri, the journal would have addressed progressive intellectuals and finally attained 'the popular function that at the very beginning the journal was seeking' (Mangoni 1999, 217n). The editors advocated the idea of a much more culturally and politically defined journal, more trenchant on the (trans)national debates and able to take its own position within the intellectual networks of the day by fostering strategic collaboration. In this sense, if Onofri urged 'a more polemic tone against other movements and journals', Salinari called for an 'open debate' that was 'veiled and elegant' (Mangoni 1999, 217n). To this end, each collaborator was supposed to write 'two short pieces (short news item, filler, commentary or satirical piece) to liven up the journal, even from a typographical viewpoint'.¹⁷ On 21 June 1945, however, a telegram from the Turin-based editorial staff re-established the initial

editorial line adopted for *Risorgimento*. The ‘politechnicism’ was probably a distinct characteristic to be preserved for the soon-to-be Vittorini project.

In line with the widening of the intellectual networks of *Risorgimento*, the editors sought a stricter collaboration with the other Einaudi periodicals, most notably with *Il Politecnico*. The new editorial projects of *Risorgimento* timely coincided with the planning of Vittorini’s journal, but only *Risorgimento* was willing to take these points of convergence further. On 17 July 1945, in a letter to Vittorini, Salinari wrote that he was glad to be a Rome-based switchboard for the Milanese editorial staff. He thus mobilised Roman intellectuals gravitating around *Risorgimento*, such as Onofri, Trombatori, Guttuso, Rodano, Giolitti, Manacorda, Purificato, Salinari, and Lombardo Radice, to urge more regular contacts and to study ‘a way to best squeeze the Roman lemon’ (Zancan 1984, 57). Hence, Rome became the initial meeting point to build a broader network, including ‘Perugia (Capitini o Binni), Florence (Luporini), Palermo (Giarratana), Naples (Alicata), Cagliari (Vincenzo Manca), etc’ (*ibid.*). At the same time, Salinari asked Vittorini, on 14 September 1945, for a short-story or an article, but the correspondence did not succeed in activating a fruitful collaboration.

If one is aware of the drive of the Rome-based editorial staff towards the Milanese journal, in the name of potential contacts and plans, Vittorini seemed much more radical with regard to the orientation that was to follow. The geo-cultural differences between the two editorial *habitus* could not find any convergence and, along with Vittorini’s charisma, the publisher Einaudi himself gradually moved towards a new relationship between intellectuals, culture and politics. On the one hand, Salinari was more hesitant with regard to the tone that the Einaudi journals, and especially *Il Politecnico*, should be adopting. In the aforementioned letter, he doubted that an overly radical tone would find sufficient progressive readers in Italy. *Risorgimento* thus remained more cautious and left controversial attitudes to Vittorini’s journal. On the other hand, Vittorini started harshly criticizing *Risorgimento*. During a joint

meeting in Rome on 25 July 1945, the debate on the journal's contributors ultimately unveiled the different positions the two editorial staffs had taken up. Vittorini criticized the idea of calling on all anti-fascist intellectuals indiscriminately, including Moravia and Croce, since neither a random collaboration with some intellectuals nor their prestige could effectively shape the identity of *Risorgimento*. In order to be a solid presence within the cultural outlook of the day, the journal had to, according to Vittorini, take a more radical position within the field, and from that unorthodox position it could become a site of debate to which different, and controversial, voices could contribute. This conception signalled a deep cultural difference between the two intellectual groups. In the words of the PCI collaborator, Kamenetzki as he concluded the meeting, 'there is some stuff that can be read in Rome, and that would never be read in Milan' (Mangoni 1999, 221).

Rome- and Milan-based Intellectuals and *impegno*

With regard to the peritextual elements, particularly the graphics, and the orientation of the contributions, the revision of *Risorgimento* marked, at least intentionally, an intermediate step towards *Il Politecnico*. The strongest contrast between the two editorial staffs is revealed, as a matter of fact, in terms of their reflection on the relationship between politics and culture. If Luisa Mangoni (1999, 215) has stressed the continuity between the Milan and Rome-based groups, since for both editorial staffs alignment with the PCI was implied, their conception of *impegno*, in relation to the peculiar stage of the immediate aftermath of WWII, was nonetheless significant to historicize the impossibility of solving their differences, which provoked both tensions between the PCI and Vittorini, and the evolution of the intellectual *habitus* within the Einaudi publishing house. In this sense, Fabrizio Onofri's contribution appeared particularly revealing. It was published in the fourth issue of *Risorgimento*, in the

form of a letter addressed to Vittorini, emblematically entitled “Letter to a northern intellectual” (see also Vittoria [1996, 1149-1151]), which did not receive a reply, at least in *Risorgimento*. Specifically, Onofri reminded Vittorini of the historical significance of their time. The ventures of the Rome-based editorial staff of Einaudi, enacted in *Risorgimento*, were located at a peculiar moment of then contemporary Italian history, that is the days coinciding with the liberation from the Nazi-Fascist occupation, with that ‘impetus and excitement, the turmoil that this experience prompted’ (Onofri 1945, 323). However, according to Onofri, if the Roman intellectuals were the first to experience this enthusiasm, now they were much more cautious with regard to the subsequent evolution of the Resistance movement than were the northern intellectuals. This caution also signalled a degree of discomfort on the part of these intellectuals, who, projected towards the creation of a national popular art, as proposed by Gramsci, had to consider the huge gap between intellectuals and the working class. In this respect, the solution to adopt was not the ‘(still intellectual and petit bourgeois) presumption’ (Onofri 1945, 324) to escape history, nor the negation of the intellectual condition, which could not be substituted by an in-progress working class, but the willingness to embrace the need to ‘serve’ the working classes. It was explicit in Onofri’s formula that intellectuals became aware of the possibility of siding with the working class. More precisely, this implied an active and responsible commitment on the cultural level, in order to ‘fight, even within the cultural field, against the Fascist and conservative forces’ (325). The purpose was to prompt a constant renewal that would contribute to the establishing of a ‘new culture’ (327). In these terms, Onofri indicated as being truly anti-fascist those intellectuals who not only fought against the Fascist regime within the space for manoeuvre allowed by the regime itself, as in the case of Benedetto Croce, but even those who fought against the Fascist ‘economic, social, and political system’ (327) as a whole, as in the case of Gobetti, Gramsci, and Colorni. In a nutshell, Onofri was legitimizing the figure of

the organic intellectual, who was active in political praxis in order to prevent the dictatorship from returning to power. The relationship between political freedom and intellectual freedom was thus indissoluble (see also Vittoria [1996, 1150]).

In this view of militant organization within the party structure, the distance between the more eclectic vision suggested by Vittorini is evident. Vittorini initially framed the actions of *Il Politecnico* under the aegis of the PCI, but this was in order to adopt a politically more definite position as opposed to the ‘welcoming’ attitude of the immediate post-WWII period. The Party’s approval also meant, as Ajello had already suggested (1979, 134), that *Il Politecnico* was able to reach out more effectively to a wider range of readers, spanning left-wing sympathizers and Communist activists, through the circulation networks of the PCI groups. As the well-known *querelle* between Vittorini and Togliatti widely demonstrated, the relationship between politics and culture that Vittorini advocated did not accept the subordination of the former to the latter.

In his letter, Onofri also charted a generational map of Italian intellectuals. He marked a point of separation between the ‘old generation (the 40-year-old intellectuals and above)’ (Onofri 1945, 328), and the ‘young generation’, who felt much more victims of than responsible for the regime. The latter tended towards a theoretical renovation of the category of ‘intellectuals,’ now impelled towards cultural, and thus social and political, progress. Born in 1908, about ten years before both Onofri and Salinari, Vittorini was actually at the threshold of this generation. Onofri tried to take a more dominant position by drawing on two main points: on the one hand, Roman intellectuals’ previous commitment to the Resistance movement, which for geographical reasons, first involved intellectuals in Rome and only later the Milanese ones, although not in the same terms; on the other hand, his belonging to the newer generation, which made the intellectual more conscious and ready to take part in the fundamentally ideological, and specifically Marxist, struggle to ‘seize the truth and progress

towards new forms of culture, along with the progress of the general conditions of the society we live in' (130). The idea of a national and popular culture (interpreted within strict dogmatic terms) was thus distant both from the cosmopolitanism and from the 'educational and Enlightenment-driven' (331) conception that was instilled in Vittorini's journal from Carlo Cattaneo's nineteenth-century *Politecnico*. Onofri concluded his letter by calling nonetheless for collaboration with the Milanese intellectuals, to club together their experiences so that 'north and south are not only geographical reference points' (*ibid.*). The sense of national identity prompted by the Secondo Risorgimento remained however only theoretical.

The analysis of this letter unveiled the distance between Vittorini and Onofri, signalling a huge gap between the two editorial staffs within Einaudi. On the one hand, the Rome-based editorial staff was increasingly and profoundly characterized by ideology, although, paradoxically, moving towards a dialogue with widely conceived anti-fascist forces, as prompted by the PCI itself; on the other hand, the Milanese editorial staff, driven by Vittorini's symbolic capital within both the political and literary field, moved in a more eclectic direction if compared to the PCI's guidelines, although it still needed to collaborate with the Party. As the famous debate between Balbo and Pavese demonstrates, Giulio Einaudi himself was affected by Vittorini's influence, involving the latter more closely within the dynamics of the publishing house and appointing him as editor of the literary series of the day. This 'pro- *Il Politecnico*' movement also marked the changing relationship with the cultural organization of the Party, which would deepen shortly. The publishing venture of *Risorgimento* thus seemed to dissolve with the intersection with *Il Politecnico*, by coming to a halt due to its diverse political position which set forth a potential juxtaposition with the then current orientations of the Turinese publisher.

Conclusions

Vittorini's reply to Onofri's letter was not published in *Risorgimento*, which, after the fifth issue, ceased publication. What were the reasons, to conclude, for this definitive closure? The fifth issue, published in August 1945, was not intended to be the last issue at all. The archival data, as well as anticipating the planning of *Risorgimento* at the beginning of 1945, allow us to suppose the actual preparation of other subsequent issues. Specifically, the planning of the sixth issue, to be published in September 1945, is demonstrated by the arrangement of an advertising space for other journals, such as *Il Ponte*,¹⁸ and by the payment for Aldo Capitini's contribution, "Dall'alto al basso", which should have been published in the sixth issue.¹⁹ Two other administrative letters, sent to Salinari by the journal *Giustizia e libertà* and the Turinese section of *L'Unità* respectively, indicate that *Risorgimento* was still alive on 8 October 1945, since both journals asked for a regular exchange. Furthermore, as noted also by Vittoria (2006, 1144n), Giorgio Amendola, on behalf of the PCI administrative office, on 16 November 1945 stated that 'it has not been decided yet whether to suppress *Risorgimento* or not'. More interestingly, in Onofri's correspondence, there is a letter from an unknown sender dated as far back as 20 November 1945, demonstrating the persistence of the project, under new terms, within the Einaudi publishing house: 'Dear Fabrizio, here is the plan for *Risorgimento*. It came today from Milan. Without doubt it is very interesting; the ideas of the friends abroad and of poems with facing-page translation are excellent'.

These materials may call into question the hypothesis that *Risorgimento* 'lost its *raison d'être* when *Società* was born' (Vittoria 2006, 1144), since *Società* had been in circulation since the summer of 1945. Furthermore, they contradict the hypothesis that *Risorgimento* was suppressed in favour of *Il Politecnico* and *Cultura Sovietica* (Bertelli 1980, 235). In theory, *Risorgimento* should not have been substituted by them but should have co-existed with the

other journals, and particularly with *Il Politecnico*. However, the latter was able to embody more effectively the then current orientations of the publishing house, thanks to Vittorini's symbolic capital and a more radical format. The reasons for the closing of *Risorgimento* lie, therefore, in the gradual change of dispositions of the Einaudi editorial staffs' *habitus* and, more significantly, of those of the *fronte della cultura*. The Rome-based journal represented the failure of the anti-fascist coalition suggested by the PCI, and initially embraced by the publisher Einaudi, in accordance with a still classical formula of the periodical media. On the one hand, the strict relationship between the Roman editorial staff and the Communist Party restricted the range of the journal, with the risk of uselessly duplicating other and even more orthodox publishing ventures, such as *Rinascita*. On the other hand, new models stood out and new synergies of dispositions interweaving within the publishing house prevented it from investing in the revision plan for *Risorgimento*. Freed from the Roman entourage and with a stronger position within the cultural field, *Il Politecnico* was more agile in its movements and more influential in building debates, thus leading the editorial project of *Risorgimento* to go into decline. However, *Risorgimento* was not just a failing or ephemeral venture, but the litmus test of a specific historical and cultural time. Its own evolution, in the editors' attempt to revise it, allows us to fully understand, in the timespan of the summer and fall of 1945, what happened in the Italian cultural world and in what directions intellectuals were going in the formulation of cultural products, in terms of literary renewal, technical specialism and innovative relationships with figurative arts. More interestingly, it allows us to bring into greater focus the politically divergent relationship between Rome- and Milan-based intellectuals and the PCI. The case of *Risorgimento*, as both a social and cultural site, is therefore exemplary when it comes to unveiling the discontinuities in the process of identity formation of Italian intellectuals, as charted in the different editorial *habitus* within the publishing house Einaudi, of their power relationships, and the system of equilibrium. This

ultimately casts a critical light on the history of publishing and intellectuals in the immediate post-WWII period in Italy.

Notes

-
- ¹ Archivio Storico della casa editrice Einaudi – Archivio di Stato di Torino (Einaudi archive, later AE), file Massimo Caprara, letter of the editorial staff of *Risorgimento*, Rome 2 January 1945.
 - ² AE, file Umberto Calosso, letter of the editorial staff of *Risorgimento*, Rome 5 January 1945.
 - ³ AE, file Fedele D'Amico, letter of the editorial staff of *Risorgimento*, Rome 17 January 1945.
 - ⁴ AE, file Franco Calamandrei, letter of the journal *Risorgimento*, Rome 21 August 1945.
 - ⁵ AE, file Giovanni Roveda, letter of the journal *Risorgimento*, Rome 10 May, 28 July and 4 September 1945.
 - ⁶ On the cultural, publishing and literary role of Vittorini, see at least Ferretti (1992), Panicali (1994), Esposito (2009).
 - ⁷ AE, file Giulio Einaudi, letter to the publishing offices, 9 August 1945.
 - ⁸ AE, file Bianca Garufi, letter to Giulio Einaudi, 9 June 1945.
 - ⁹ AE, file Carlo Muscetta, letter of *Risorgimento* editorial staff, 30 July 1945.
 - ¹⁰ AE, file Paolo Alatri, letter of *Risorgimento* editorial staff, 28 July 1945.
 - ¹¹ AE, file Guido Calogero, letter to Giulio Einaudi, Rome 3 September 1945.
 - ¹² AE, file Bianca Garufi, minutes of the meeting of *Risorgimento*, Rome 6 June 1945. The minutes are partially quoted also in Mangoni (1999, 216-7n).

-
- 13 AE, file Bianca Garufi, letter to Giulio Einaudi, Rome 9 June 1945.
- 14 AE, file Bianca Garufi, minutes of the journal *Risorgimento*, Rome 6 June 1945.
- 15 AE, file Natalino Sapegno, letter of *Risorgimento* editorial staff, Rome 10 April 1945.
- 16 AE, file Bianca Garufi, minutes of the *Risorgimento* meeting, Rome 6 June 1945.
- 17 AE, file Bianca Garufi, minutes of the *Risorgimento* meeting, Rome 6 June 1945.
- 18 AE, file Piero and Ada Calamandrei, letter of *Risorgimento* editorial staff, Rome 6 September 1945.
- 19 AE, file Aldo Capitini, letter of *Risorgimento* editorial staff, Rome 28 August 1945.

References

- Ajello, Nello. 1979. *Intellettuali e PCI*. Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- Baioni, Massimo. 2003. "Miti di fondazione: il Risorgimento democratico e la Repubblica." In *Almanacco della Repubblica: storia d'Italia attraverso le tradizioni, le istituzioni e le simbologie repubblicane*, edited by Maurizio Ridolfi, 185-196, Milan: Bruno Mondadori.
- Bendiscioli, Mario. 1974. "La resistenza come 'Secondo Risorgimento'." In *Antifascismo e Resistenza*, second edition, 117-128. Rome: Nuova Universale Studium.
- Bertelli, Sergio. 1980. *Il gruppo. La formazione del gruppo dirigente del PCI, 1936-48*. Milan: Rizzoli.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1992. *Les règles de l'art: g n se et structure du champ litt raire*. Paris: Seuil.
- Buchignani, Paolo. 2013. "Il mito del Risorgimento tradito nella cultura post-unitaria e novecentesca." In *Quale Risorgimento? Interpretazioni a confronto tra Fascismo,*

-
- Resistenza e nascita della Repubblica*, edited by Carmelo Calabrò and Mauro Lenci, 41-61. Pisa: ETS.
- De Michele, Vincenzo. 2010. *Il Secondo Risorgimento: una meditazione sul decennio della 'Ricostruzione', 1943-54*. Naples: Guida.
- Esposito, Edoardo, ed. 2009. *Il dèmon dell'anticipazione: cultura, letteratura, editoria in Elio Vittorini*. Milan: Il Saggiatore.
- Ferretti, Gian Carlo. 1992. *L'editore Vittorini*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Francese, Joseph. 2000. *Cultura e politica negli anni Cinquanta: Salinari, Pasolini, Calvino*. Rome: Lithos.
- Galli della Loggia, Ernesto and Agnès Roche. 2008. "Formes et fonctions de l'antifascisme dans la vie politique italienne: légitimité ou légitimation?." *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'Histoire* 100 "Italie, la présence du passé" (October-December): 69-78.
- Mangoni, Luisa. 1999. *Pensare i libri. La casa editrice Einaudi dagli anni Trenta agli anni Sessanta*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Martinelli, Renzo. 1995. *Storia del Partito comunista italiano. VI: il "partito nuovo" dalla Liberazione al 18 aprile*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Onofri, Fabrizio. 1945. "Lettera a un intellettuale del Nord." *Risorgimento* no. 4: 323-332.
- Panicali, Anna. 1994. *Elio Vittorini: la narrativa, la saggistica, le traduzioni, le riviste, l'attività editoriale*. Milan: Ugo Mursia editore.
- Pavone, Claudio. 1995. *Alle origini della Repubblica: scritti su Fascismo, antifascismo e continuità dello Stato*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Risorgimento (editorial staff), 1945a. "Presentazione." *Risorgimento* no. 1: 3-4.
- Stancanelli, Annalisa. 2008. *Vittorini e i balloons: i fumetti del "Politecnico"*. Rome: Bonanno editore.

-
- Traniello, Francesco. 1997. "Sulla definizione della Resistenza come 'Secondo Risorgimento'." In *Le idee costituzionali della Resistenza. Atti del Convegno di studi, Roma 19-21 ottobre 1995*, edited by Claudia Franceschini, Sandro Guerrieri and Giancarlo Monina, 17-25. Rome: Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri.
- Vittoria, Albertina. 1996. "Nascita della democrazia e impegno degli intellettuali in *Politecnico, Risorgimento e Società, 1945-1948*." *Storia contemporanea* no. 6: 1121-1163.
- Vittorini, Elio. 1945. "Una nuova cultura." *Il Politecnico* no. 1:1.
- Zancan, Marina. 1984. *Il progetto "Politecnico": cronaca e struttura di una rivista*. Venice: Marsilio.
- Zancan, Marina. 2009. "Il Politecnico e la narrativa del dopoguerra." In *Il demone dell'anticipazione. Cultura, letteratura, editoria in Elio Vittorini*, edited by Edoardo Esposito, 83-100, Milan: Il Saggiatore.