Introduction

> The city, however, does not tell its past, but contains it like the lines of a hand, written in the corners of the streets, the gratings of the windows, the banisters of the steps, the antennae of the lightning rods, the poles of the flags, every segment marked in turn with scratches, indentations, scrolls.[1]

At the opening of Dino Buzzati's short story 'Paura alla Scala' (1949), the Milanese bourgeoisie are gathered in the foyer of the city's renowned opera house for a performance of the fictional composer Pierre Grossgemüth's new opera *La strage degli innocenti*.[2] An opera based on a biblical tale, it also portrays an allegory of Nazi atrocity. A police search warrant is put in place to inspect those who enter the theatre, in an attempt to prevent rebellious activity. Yet danger lurks outside in the city. During the first interval, news reports arrive of a revolution under way on the streets of Milan: a group of dissidents has seemingly taken advantage of the fact that the elite are ensconced in the opera house. The audience decides it is safer to spend the night at the theatre, rather than risk the streets after dark. As the tale unfolds, contemporary social conflict is disseminated through the story of a night at the opera. The occasion – a much-hyped media event of an Italian premiere by a famous foreign composer – resonates with the events we will encounter in this book.

In this parable of real-life events and of fears of political unrest in the buildup to the 1948 elections, Buzzati uses a gala evening at the opera to tell a story of class antagonism and social turmoil in the aftermath of World War II. But 'Paura alla Scala' also plays on deeper themes and tensions. The iconic place of Italian opera may have become the last refuge of the bourgeoisie, but the story also introduces a more unsettling, pervasive sense of crisis and immanent catastrophe. Despite having an ongoing cultural tradition as its focus, the unpredictable and the unexpected reign supreme. The possibility of aesthetic retreat or escape from contemporary political turbulence and fear is denied: opera in whatever form – even a timely work of the avant-garde – has become hopelessly out of touch with what is happening outside. And yet those seeking refuge within the old genre's sonic confines cannot remain unaffected by the exterior events.

[1] Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, trans. William Weaver (London: Vintage, 1997 [1972]), 11. Reprinted by permission of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc. (1974).

[2] The story opens a collection of short stories with the same name: Dino Buzzati, *Paura alla Scala* (Milan: Mondadori, 2011 [1949]), 3–40.

The present book is in some ways a continuation and critique of Buzzati's short tale, transported to another Italian city. It tells the story of what was happening to opera culture at the midpoint of the twentieth century from the perspective of postwar Venice. The city and its culture, from the late 1940s to the early 1960s, are at once typical and idiosyncratic. Both Venice and opera at this time are often talked about in strikingly similar terms: as museums locked in the past and blind to the future. Through a focus on operatic production and reception in the city, viewed within broader transnational discourses of modernism, cultural crisis and new media, I want to show that these clichés can be turned on their heads: that postwar opera crisis was in fact remarkably productive and that, despite being physically locked in the past, the city of Venice was flourishing with modernist and avant-garde activity. Indeed the city was to play host to some of the major operatic events of the postwar decades. That Venice had become such an apt place for postwar operatic revival was the result of its complex legacy: the city's material structure had been protected from Allied bombing, and its culture was the beneficiary of nearly two decades of Fascist investment.

In this introductory chapter I will begin by outlining some of the key tropes that interweave what follows: the idea of crisis, the plight of the Left and the role of mass media. I will then go on to consider in greater depth the two central thematic frameworks of the book – Fascism and Venice – before providing an overview of the establishment of postwar culture. However, this is not simply a story about opera in Venice after Fascism. Each of the works and performances considered in this book gestures far beyond the city's confines in various ways. Neither is it simply a study of Italy. The chapters situate the musical happenings in Venice in relation to regional, national and transnational networks and discourses. Even when the focus is on the Italian reception of a work by an Italian composer, this reception was shaped by foreign perspectives and transnational discourses. At the same time, this is a book that in some ways questions the idea of nation; Venice's historically uneasy relationship with the Italian nation state alone opens up a set of issues related to notions of national affiliation and identity. The city has always embodied a more transnational imaginary: from its role as a trading hub and cosmopolitan meeting place, to the fact that its culture has attracted numerous foreign visitors, artists and intellectuals. Specificity does not, in this case, entail an isolated case study with a limited purview.

This means that, in what follows, Venice will sometimes be in the foreground, as an active protagonist, and at other times it will recede into the background, its symbolic and material presence bubbling under the surface. Each chapter will pose different discursive delineations of Venice that emerged across the 1950s, from its symbolism and mythology to its transnationalism and global embeddedness. But through all this, I want to argue that there was something singularly appropriate and consequential about Venice as a vital home for opera after World War II. The important point here is the perspective of the local. This is not to imply that there was anything inherently

local in the events under scrutiny; rather that the city – when viewed as a stage for such musical activity – brings to the fore and refracts previously overlooked characteristics, ones that often found their place in local discourse. Opera *in* Venice, rather than *Venetian* opera. Such an approach also seeks to provincialise Italian modernism, the avant-garde and opera culture, taking them away from the usual urban centres of focus (Milan and Turin) and more general theoretical accounts.[3] Indeed I even want to suggest here that Venice became a useful frame for the reception of modernism, a rhetorical means for positioning the idiosyncrasies of modernism – particularly in the field of opera – in the mid-twentieth century. When viewed within this locale, operatic modernism emerges as a discourse fraught with contradiction and opposition, but characterised by an indebtedness to older cultural forms and practices – something inherent, above all, in Venice's city-fabric.

The book centres on two key questions: why did certain discourses of opera crisis resurface at specific moments in the century; and why did they find a particular resonance in Venice? A determining factor here is the ongoing perception of crisis that shadowed seminal cultural and political moments in the first half of the twentieth century. In coming to terms with its past and reinventing itself in the aftermath of war and Fascism, Italy seemed to have constant recourse to a sense of crisis. The historian John Dickie has written about 'a patriotism of pathos' that marked the post-Fascist era, which consisted of an 'inverted patriotism' of constant worry and pessimism over the nation-state, its culture and identity – a phenomenon that in fact harked back to unification.[4] In musical debate, this seemed to centre above all on the direction of musical language and culture. 'Inverted patriotism' found its place in a constant preoccupation with the state of opera, the appropriateness of modernism in the Italian situation and the role that music could play in postwar reconstruction. What is remarkable about mid-century musical and social discourse is the relentless sense of imminent catastrophe that haunted debate, as well as the sheer multiplicity of crises that drove it.

One corollary of this sense of crisis was a concern with the waning popularity of opera, something that seemed to have become entwined with the plight of the Left in Italy. If the communists had long held a position of cultural authority, one intensified by losing much of their political power after the 1948 elections, then this authority was predominantly in the realm of *cultura* in the Italian sense (predominantly high culture).

[3] An important precursor in modernism and avant-garde studies is Walter Adamson, *Avant-Garde Florence: From Modernism to Fascism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993). It is important to point out, however, that all Italian cities self-styled themselves as in some ways detached from the idea of the nation.

[4] John Dickie, 'The Notion of Italy', in Zygmunt G. Barański and Rebecca J. West, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Italian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008 [2001]), 17–33, here 29.

The majority of communists still proposed a top-down model of the influence of intellectuals on the masses (determining and promoting *cultura popolare*). However, the problem was that they failed to recognise that their vision of *cultura popolare* was becoming extinct – merging instead into a *cultura di massa*. The Left continued to see the latter, somewhat ironically, as a manipulation of consumers by pernicious powers, long after the huge proliferation of mass media across the first half of the century had rendered the situation more complicated.

Part of this hostility to mass culture may have been a result of the Left's awareness that to forego a more old-fashioned vision of popular culture would have meant renouncing their cultural and political authority. Leftist critics seemed to realise the need to reinforce opera as a genre still capable of speaking to the masses, and the need to democratise music criticism (even if that ultimately meant relinquishing their own position), as well as evolving new concepts of the 'popular' for opera in postwar society. In other words, a loss of supremacy to the field of mass culture would inevitably mean obsolescence on all fronts. In addition, their somewhat hostile perspective could also have been due to memories of the Fascist use of media, such as the radio, remaining fresh in national consciousness (even if less explicit in discourse), as well as the fact that, at least until the later 1950s, the Democrazia Cristiana (DC) exerted a disproportionate amount of control over such media.[5] In this sense, Italian leftist critics shared a similar mode of critique with contemporary transnational Marxist discourses on the media. However, it is important to see through this pervasive rhetoric of crisis, to uncover what it hid from view: the continuities across supposedly watershed moments or perceptions of change, the productivity such rhetoric seemed to instil, as well as a lingering sense of hope formed even in the face of the most threatening spheres of cultural activity (such as the mass media).

The media will thus be another important trope in what follows. Each case study embodies a moment of conflict between the need to exploit the means new mass media provided and a wariness about their growing hegemony. In other words, the continuation of older genres seemed to be premised on the need to compete with the experiences new media were seen to enable. And yet despite newer media, such as radio and cinema, dominating debate, it was print media that fuelled the activity and did most of the recording of operatic events for posterity. There was also a discursive trope of imaginary and emergent media: how important a particular medium was in discussion often took no account of how ubiquitous it was (or even whether it actually existed yet). Television, for example, was conceived of as a threat to opera long before

[5] Paolo Murialdi notes that, because they failed to realise the importance of the radio in political and social life, the Left did not fight government control of Radiotelevisione italiana RAI; Murialdi, *Storia del giornalismo italiano: dalle prime gazzette al telegiornali* (Turin: Gutenberg, 1986), 174–80. The DC had been founded in 1943 as a Roman Catholic, centrist party.

it was introduced. Thus, although the importance of mass media and new technologies is often assumed to have crystallised around the years of the height of the so-called economic miracle (1958–63), the contents of this book show that in fact many of the debates took place much earlier in the 1950s – a period that has tended to be overshadowed by the collapse of Fascism and the aftermath of war.[6] But while processes of modernisation were underway almost immediately from the later 1940s and into the 1950s, there was simultaneously an awareness of the need for the public not to lose sight of their own historical positioning. The leftist debate on the media embodied this divide: on the one hand, such means were seen as increasing passivity and inertia in the populace; on the other hand they were seen as harbouring the potential to empower the public and instigate change.

This dual concern with the empowerment of the public while also awakening them from a state of stultification was one response to the issue of how to be aesthetically anti-Fascist in the postwar period. During the 1950s this preoccupation formed among the Left around the importance of *impegno* (commitment). What is particularly striking is that this aesthetic position was applied above all to modernist and avant-garde activity. Critics and commentators recognised that art had to be stylistically at the forefront of transnational activity, while not losing sight of its ethical purpose. The difficulties of reconciling such a position were endlessly debated in the scholarly and mainstream press. And this only intensified as the 1950s progressed: if there was a sense in the immediate postwar period of the need to move on from the recent past, by the late 1950s there was a growing concern with national remembering. This is perhaps why Luigi Nono's *Intolleranza 1960* came to be the most discussed opera of those considered here: it directly touched on the uneasy relationship between musical modernism and the contemporary cultural politics of memory and popularity.

That moments of resurgence in the city's musical life were often based on avant-garde and theatrical activity is an observation that might jar with our usual assumptions of Venice at mid-century as an amphibious tourist museum. In the chapters that follow, I will excavate the intricate cultural politics that underpinned these aesthetic choices, as well as how the performances reverberated. Underneath seemingly conservative slogans about the city's built environment, such as *dov'era, com'era* (where it was, as it was), and a public rhetoric of preservation, conservation and museology, there was a renewed vigour in musical life – one all the more surprising for being ensconced in a lugubrious rhetoric of crisis.[7]

[6] A similar point has been made by David Forgacs and Stephen Gundle, who note that although 1950s culture is often seen as a 'primitive forerunner' of the mass culture of the 1960s, it was in fact 'a decisive stage in the slow gestation of that era'; see Forgacs and Gundle, *Mass Culture and Italian Society from Fascism to the Cold War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 1.

[7] This saying has long been applied to restoration work in the city; for example, when the Campanile in Piazza San Marco collapsed in 1902, it was rebuilt according to how it was before.

FASCISM

Although the events in the following chapters all took place in the postwar period, one important underlying context is Fascist culture, the legacy of which was felt for decades after the regime's collapse in 1943–5.[8] While a detailed account of Fascism is beyond the remit of this book, several aspects are worth highlighting here. First, political and aesthetic oscillations and contradictions meant that Fascism lacked a stable core: from staunch anti-clericalism to the promotion of Roman Catholicism; from cultural modernism to reactionary conservatism; from mocking anti-Semitism to the adoption of Nazi-style racial ideology. Yet other aspects of the regime remained relatively constant: anti-parliamentarianism; heightened nationalism and autarchy; a totalitarian conception of the state; the collective over the individual; emphasis on discipline, hierarchy and authority – all expressed in a populist rhetoric; history as national rather than class conflict; the cult of youth; an anti-capitalism built on idiosyncratic industrialisation, modernisation and bureaucratisation. Such idiosyncrasy – a determining feature of the regime also evident in the cultural sphere – was in part because Fascist society was governed by syndicates, each with its own agenda and ideological values. Unlike other forms of totalitarianism, Mussolini's regime tried to co-opt, rather than dictate, individual endeavours. This attracted many intellectuals and artists to the party, keeping its cultural policy (to the extent that there was one) relatively pluralist. The regime was, as a result, notably more pro-modernist and avant-gardist in cultural terms than Nazi Germany.

Second, Fascism had a particular relationship with the idea of crisis. A renewed rhetoric of crisis had pervaded daily life and culture in the interwar period, even nestling in Fascism's own identity. Both Fascism's originary moment and its demise were premised on an understanding of the time as one of crisis. The regime's self-declared moment of insurgence, the march on Rome in October 1922, was asserted as an imposition of, and consequently a taking charge within, a state of emergency. Whereas crisis was seen to make Fascism possible, by the Armistice of Cassibile, publicly released on 8 September 1943, a climate of crisis rendered the regime unviable.[9] Perceived as the collapse of the nation, the armistice immediately raised questions over Italy's future and identity. The population had suffered greatly during the war, enduring devastating military defeats, racial persecution, economic havoc and humiliating defeat and occupation on home soil. The period 1943–5 was one of almost

[8] I capitalise 'Fascism' throughout the book to denote that I am referring to the Italian Partito nazionale fascista, and not fascism as a more general form of totalitarian politics (of which Nazism is another variant). Fascism emerged as a major political force in 1919–20, with the assault on town halls and municipal centres.

[9] Having entered the war in June 1940, by September 1943 Italy was forced to surrender, following widespread defeat of its armed forces and growing dissatisfaction with the regime.

civil war, with Allied occupation in the South and German occupation in the North, as well as growing Resistance movements in much of the country and a puppet Fascist regime at Salò, led by a weakened Mussolini. In the aftermath, the country became a republic, its monarchy compromised by its relationship with the Fascists; many of the party's leaders fled and the army was dispersed.

The significance of crisis for the regime's self-identity has also been a feature of subsequent scholarly analyses: historian Walter Adamson has interpreted Fascist culture as a response to a crisis of modernity, while others such as the historian Zeev Sternhell have understood the regime's revolutionary impetus as due to a crisis both of Marxism and liberalism. These readings underpin a long-standing debate on Fascism: whether it had its own ideology (according to Sternhell), or was premised on a 'sacralisation' or 'aestheticisation' of politics (according to Adamson and others).[10] With the benefit of historical distance, it is perhaps now possible to move beyond these polarised interpretations, and instead recognise Fascism's rhetorical self-creation and self-fashioning, as well as the values and interpellations that fuelled its discourse.[11]

These two features of Fascist political and cultural discourse – the contradiction and ambivalence, along with the pervasive sense of crisis – also played out in the musical landscape. In contrast to Nazi Germany, the situation under Fascism was more aesthetically plural and, at least until the late 1930s, not governed by racial laws.[12] Schoenberg's music, for example, was widely performed in Italy until 1938, and Berg's was heard as late as 1942. Again, while an overview of musical culture under the regime would be the subject for another study, several points are worth stressing here. As within other cultural spheres, musical life was dominated by the regime's corporate structures: patronage, festivals and competitions dictated the musical year and enmeshed musicians in the Fascist fold. A survey of these reveals relatively open sponsorship of diverse and eclectic practices. Contemporary music was given particular prominence, with the Mostra del Novecento Musicale Italiano held in Bologna from 31 March to 12 April 1927, and the Mostre Nazionali devoted to contemporary music, first held in Rome in May 1930. The Venice Festival Internazionale di Musica Contemporanea was inaugurated in 1930 and was immediately established as a place for

[10] For an overview of the debate, see Antonio Costa Pinto, 'Fascist Ideology Revisited: Zeev Sternhell and His Critics', *European History Quarterly*, 16/4 (1986), 465–83, and Robert Wohl, 'French Fascism, Both Right and Left: Reflections on the Sternhell Controversy', *Journal of Modern History*, 63/1 (1991), 91–8.

[11] Barbara Spackman also calls for a move beyond the old debate in *Fascist Virilities: Rhetoric, Ideology, and Social Fantasy in Italy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), x.

[12] Roberto Illiano, ed., *Italian Music During the Fascist Period* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004) and Harvey Sachs, *Music in Fascist Italy* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987) provide general surveys of the period. Fiamma Nicolodi, *Musica e musicisti nel ventennio fascista* (Fiesole: Discanto Edizioni, 1984), remains an important source of information. For a significant new account of the period, see Ben Earle, *Luigi Dallapiccola and Musical Modernism in Fascist Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

both old and new, with an emphasis – initially, at least – on instrumental rather than theatrical music. In 1933 the conductor Vittorio Gui founded the Maggio Musicale Fiorentino, also with the mission to promote operatic revival and renewal. Such festivals and exhibitions were central to Fascist self-representation, allowing possibilities for historiographical rewriting and expropriation.

These occasions provoked significant debate about the direction that musical culture under the regime should take. Discussion was polarised between pro-modernists, such as the composers Alfredo Casella, Gian Francesco Malipiero and Luigi Dallapiccola, and administrators and politicians Mario Labroca, Giuseppe Bottai and Nicola de Pirro; and anti-modernists, such as the politician Roberto Farinacci and composers Ildebrando Pizzetti and Ottorino Respighi. Initiatives such as the Società Italiana di Musica Moderna, founded in 1917 by Casella, Malipiero and Gabriele D'Annunzio, were devised to further modernist interests. Casella later abandoned the Società to form the Corporazione delle Nuove Musiche, which had similar aims, in 1923. Conversely, in December 1932 the anti-modernist *Manifesto dei dieci* was published in the *Corriere della sera* and *La stampa*. Written by Alceo Toni, a music critic for the Fascist *Il popolo d'Italia*, and including Respighi and Pizzetti among its signatories, it was a thinly-veiled attack on figures such as Casella and Malipiero, claiming that their espousal of musical modernism was inherently internationalist and anti-Italian.[13]

While such disputes took place over the aesthetics of modernism, equal importance was given to the recovery of music from the nation's past – work often officially sponsored by the regime. The music of composers such as Monteverdi and Vivaldi was enjoying a revival, often as the result of scholarly and philological endeavour led by Venetian figures (especially Malipiero) and centred on Venetian archives. Venice was reinscribed as the birth place of opera, part of the Fascists' project to make the city a cultural stage. Fascist music culture was thus characterised by the simultaneous emphasis on modernism and revivalism; a fostering of eclecticism and hybridity were to become its distinctive traits.

Amid these multifarious currents in Fascist music culture, the situation within operatic culture specifically remained complicated. Although Mussolini seemed relatively uninterested in opera compared to other musical genres (and to film), much critical discourse was devoted to the need for opera's renewal. Casella led such calls, drawing a connection between a new aesthetics of operatic spectacle and Fascist ideology. The survival of opera was deemed all the more urgent with the death of Puccini in 1924, which prompted fresh cries that the genre was entering its death

[13] As if to reinforce the pluralist nature of Fascist cultural policy, however, Mussolini personally wrote to Alfredo Casella and Gian Francesco Malipiero after the manifesto's publication, assuring them that its sentiments did not come from higher office.

throes. The importance of the past lingered in these calls for renewal: new opera was to be a synthesis of tradition and modernity, capable of taking its place in the canon beside long-established classics. This contradiction at the heart of Fascist music culture – of the importance of Italian heritage, but also of the need for cultural modernisation – is something we will repeatedly encounter in the 1950s.

Fascism was quick to arrive in Venice, the city's Fascio di Combattimento being only the second to be formed in the country, in April 1919.[14] The Venetian Biennio Rosso (1919–20) was characterised by a rapid shift from socialism to Fascism in many of the city's institutions. Newspapers such as *La gazzetta di Venezia* (traditionally the paper of the Venetian aristocracy and middle classes) and *Il gazzettino* (with a broader readership) both came out in support of the party. Fascist activity within the city was divided: on the one hand, governed by the requirements of the regime; and on the other concerned with the needs of tourism – needs that were sometimes in conflict with one another. The 'grand tour' of previous centuries had been replaced by a yearly tourist season. The businessman and Fascist politician Count Giuseppe Volpi's Compagnia italiana grandi alberghi (CIGA), together with the tourist office, organised the city's social life in accordance with the growing influx of wealthy visitors.

The Fascists focussed on Venice as a focal point for the renewal of the nation's culture, in particular revitalising the Biennale, the city's contemporary visual art exhibition. The event had begun in 1895, and was initially run by the Comune di Venezia. In bringing the Biennale under state ownership in 1930 – overseen by a designated body (an Ente autonomo) – the Fascists intended to have a direct role in its running, making the festival a statement of the nation's high culture, on display for the rest of the world.[15] The Biennale was organised by a fine arts syndicate, with the explicit intention of providing a platform for both local and national endeavours in response to a provincialism they saw as having been prevalent under Giolittian liberalism.[16] In addition, in an attempt to counter perceptions of Venice as backward-looking and reliant on its past (something perceived to be a problem for Italy more generally), the syndicate directly encouraged the display of avant-garde works. Having founded the contemporary music festival in 1930, they established the Esposizione Internazionale d'Arte Cinematografica in 1932. Both of these new festivals were

[14] For an account of the early years of Fascism in Venice, see Raffaele Vicentini, *Il movimento fascista veneto attraverso il diario di uno squadrista* (Venice: Stamperia Zanetti, 1935).

[15] Marla Susan Stone notes that the huge sums spent and attention given to the Venice Biennale between 1928 and 1942 were intended to make it 'the primary site of evolving Fascist arts patronage strategies'; Stone, *The Patron State: Culture and Politics in Fascist Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 60.

[16] Giovanni Giolitti (1842–1928) was a liberal Italian statesman who served as prime minister of Italy five times between 1892 and 1921.

intended as showcases for national and even international works at the forefront of modern culture, as well as – in the case of the former – works from the nation's past.[17]

The music festival was thus run in conjunction with the Biennale, presided over by the composer, conductor and ardent Fascist Adriano Lualdi, and under the aegis of the regime. Lualdi wrote in the festival's opening programme that, despite its international character, it remained an unadulterated Italian and Fascist institution.[18] Casella was appointed Vice President, and Labroca and Malipiero were on the executive committee. From the start there were therefore management divisions between the aesthetically conservative and the modernists. This led to a degree of eclecticism in the festival's programming, with a mix of old and new, dodecaphony and neoclassicism, instrumental works and opera. While some events took place outdoors and in smaller theatres, many occurred at the city's main opera house, the Teatro La Fenice. The composer and conductor Goffredo Petrassi was appointed General Director of the theatre from 1937 to 1940. In an interview with the music historian Harvey Sachs, he noted that the arts had enjoyed relative freedom up until the mid-1930s, after which increased Fascist autarchy and pressure from Germany led to tighter control.[19]

The Fascist context is all the more important for what came after the war. The relative pluralism of cultural life under much of the regime's rule made its legacy especially complicated, and the issue of how to be aesthetically anti-Fascist only more problematic. Following the collapse of the regime, this question lingered, made complex by the fact that the system of state patronage had involved vast numbers of musicians and other cultural figures; a large degree of continuity seemed inevitable. Continuity was evident in government and civil service: since membership of Fascist syndicates had been near obligatory for many professions, thorough postwar purging would have resulted in disbanding most of the civil service and government apparatus. A certain amount of reconciliation and accommodation with the past was thus deemed necessary. At the same time, a rhetoric of renewal and fresh starts was promulgated to conceal the underlying continuity.

It is precisely this messy legacy that the present book seeks to disentangle. I want to reframe claims made against Italy under Fascist rule as musically uninteresting, and instead investigate how this plurality and continuity made the regime's aftermath all

[17] Critic Giuseppe Pugliese discussed this dual function of the music festival as having 'had to work with an eye to the past . . . without losing sight of the present and in a certain sense the future', in his speech 'Un compito difficile', given at a meeting of the festival management committee, on 2 May 1961, transcribed in the Rotary Club of Venice's *Annata Rotariana* (1960–1), Supplemento bollettino n.21.

[18] Adriano Lualdi, cited in Nicolodi, 'Su alcuni aspetti dei festivals tra le due guerre', in Nicolodi, ed., *Musica italiana del primo novecento – 'La generazione dell'ottanta' – Atti del convegno, Firenze 9-10-11 maggio 1980* (Florence: Olschki, 1981), 141–203, here 162.

[19] Sachs, *Music in Fascist Italy*, 137.