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Abstract:
In the aftermath of the Second World War, Italian intellectuals participated in Italy's reconstruction with an ideological commitment inspired by the African-American struggle for equal rights in the United States. Drawing on the work of many of the leading figures in postwar Italian culture, including Italo Calvino, Giorgio Caproni, Cesare Pavese, and Elio Vittorini, this essay argues that Italian intellectual impegno—defined as the effort to remake Italian culture and to guide Italian social reform—was united with a significant investment in the African-American cause. The author terms this tendency impegno nero and traces its development in the critical reception of African-American writers including W.E.B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, and Richard Wright. Postwar impegno nero is then contrasted with the treatment of African-American themes under Fascism, when commentators had likewise condemned American racism, but had paradoxically linked their laments for the plight of African Americans with defenses of the racial policies of the Fascist regime. Indeed, Fascist colonialism and anti-Semitism were both justified through references to what Fascist intellectuals believed to be America's greater injustices. After 1945, in contrast, Italian intellectuals advocated an international, interdependent campaign for justice, symbolizing national reforms by projecting them onto an emblematic America. In this way, impegno nero revived and revised the celebrated "myth of America" that had developed in Italy between the world wars. Advancing a new, postwar myth, Italian intellectuals adopted the African-American struggle in order to reinforce their own efforts in the ongoing struggle for justice in Italy.
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**Impegno nero: Italian Intellectuals and the African-American Struggle**

Charles L. Leavitt IV

In the aftermath of the Second World War, Italian culture and society were reshaped by a prolonged, insistent, and profound engagement with the African-American struggle for freedom and equality. Inspired by rising black opposition to the racial injustices of the United States, prominent Italian intellectuals devoted themselves to the African-American cause, coupling their advocacy of racial equality abroad with their ongoing pursuit of social and political reform in Italy. They envisioned an international, interdependent campaign for justice, one in which Italy’s prospects were contingent upon and inseparable from those of the United States. This united commitment to the battles for freedom and equality at home and abroad—a commitment founded upon notions of a common cause and a common front shared by African Americans and Italians—was a characteristic tendency of postwar Italian culture, one that I propose to call *impegno nero*.

A new coinage, *impegno nero* builds on and glosses received notions of Italian intellectual *impegno*, which I take to refer to the “exhortation that intellectuals work not just to clarify, but also to collaborate in, the construction of a new society” (“invito all’‘intellettuale’ perché la sua opera sia non soltanto chiarificatrice, ma anche collaboratrice nell’edificazione di una società nuova”), in the concise formulation of Eugenio Garin.¹ In its scope and objectives, *impegno* has often been interpreted as a primarily or even an exclusively national project. Thus it is generally understood that in the years of the anti-Fascist Resistance and the postwar reconstruction—the “years of *impegno*” (“anni dell’impegno”) as Norberto Bobbio terms them—intellectuals committed themselves to the cause of reclaiming Italy from Fascism and reforming Italian society and culture after the war.² And yet, *impegno* was always oriented internationally as well: even, and perhaps especially, after Fascism, Italian intellectuals from across the political spectrum understood their project as part of a worldwide reformation, drawing strength and stimulus from developments abroad as they sought to reimagine and to rebuild the nation.³

---


³ On the internationalism of anti-Fascist *impegno*, see, for instance, the anthology compiled by Massimo Scioscioli, Massimo Billi, and Giuliano Torlontano, *Europeismo repubblicano* (Rome: Archivio Trimestrale, 1984), esp. 57-152; the chapter on “The Legacy of Fascism: Redefining Italy After Mussolini,” in Robert A. Ventresca, *From
Impegno nero, which inspired many of Italy’s cultural leaders to unite their arguments for Italian social and cultural renewal with their condemnations of American racism, is a case in point. In fact, it may be the archetypal example. Italian intellectuals participated in Italy’s reconstruction with an ideological commitment inspired, to a significant but heretofore underappreciated degree, by the African-American struggle for equal rights in the United States.

Endeavoring to anatomize and to historicize impegno nero, this essay unpacks a series of powerful analogies between Italy’s social ills and America’s racial dynamics, stressing the cultural and political implications of Italian intellectuals’ engagement with the African-American experience. I argue that discussions of American shortcomings and American reforms conveyed covert and often overt allusions to Italy’s postwar projects, and I suggest that Italy’s intellectual leaders sought to symbolize local and national reforms by projecting them onto an emblematic America. The rhetoric of solidarity with the African-American cause thus came to constitute a new Italian “myth of America,” an attempt to “discover America” within Italy by adapting the insights of American social critics in order to address the challenges facing Italian society after the war. Tracing the correlations between this new American mythology and its celebrated precedent, the Italian mito dell’America of the 1930s, I insist that both tendencies were characterized by their self-reflective hermeneutics, their desire to uncover the Italian connotations of every critical analysis of the American situation. It is this self-reflexivity, this self-critical approach to the fight for racial equality, that distinguishes impegno nero from Fascism’s earlier criticisms of American racism, which were equally vigorous but far less rigorous, shaped as they were by a desire to vindicate rather than to interrogate Italian norms. Although prominent intellectuals loyal to the Fascist regime had condemned American racism and celebrated African-American culture, that is to say, they had done so while paradoxically accepting and even endorsing Italy’s own Racial Laws and its colonial expansion in Africa. Betraying a selective moral outrage, they indicted American injustices and excused Italy’s own unjust, racist policies. Postwar intellectuals sought instead to promote a more coherent program, uniting their critique of the United States with an uncompromising critique of Italian society. Impegno nero thus entailed the denunciation of injustices both at home and abroad: its proponents strove to present a united front and championed social reform in Italy as a necessary corollary and component of the ongoing struggle for reform in the United States.

Central to these efforts was the desire to uncover commonalities between the Italian and the American situations. Impegno nero thus relied on an instrumentalized interpretative methodology, one which led through analogy from an American precedent to a new Italian paradigm. In effect, then, impegno nero was a category of literary or cultural criticism, a mode of reading that sought to discover points of intersection between American texts and an Italian context. As such, it was both responsible for and dependent on the explosion of Italian interest in African-American writers after the Second World War. The five years that followed the war’s conclusion saw Italian translations of major works of African-American literature including Langston Hughes’s Not Without Laughter (1947) and Mulatto (1949); Zora Neale Hurston’s Moses, Man of the Mountain (1946); Richard Wright’s Black Boy (1947), Native Son (1947), and Uncle Tom’s Children (1949); and Frank Yerby’s The Foxes of Harrow (1948).\(^4\) In the same
years, many of Italy’s leading cultural journals, including *Il Politecnico* (1946), *Quaderni di poesia* (1946), *Oggi* (1946), *Società* (1946), *Sud* (1947), and *La Cittadella* (1947), published influential anthologies of African-American poetry. These anthologies and editions, in turn, were accompanied by a number of literary histories that focused in whole or in part on African-American authors, including Virgilio Luciani’s *Sette poeti negri* (1946), Leone Piccioni’s *Letteratura dei negri d’America* (1949), Luigi Berti’s *Canti negri* (1949), Carlo Izzo’s *Poesia americana contemporanea e poesia negra* (1949), and Gabriele Baldini’s *Poeti americani* (1949). Introducing Italian readers to the African-American literary tradition as well as to the African-American struggle for equality, these texts, which proliferated after the war, were not only signs but also sites of *impegno nero*, and should be read and interpreted in this light. Despite the many important studies reconsidering the diffusion of African-American culture in Europe, however, there has as yet been no comprehensive investigation of African-American literature in Italy, nor of the cultural and political ties between African Americans and Italians.

---


It is time to reassess the Italian engagement with African-American literature and the struggle for Civil Rights in the aftermath of the Second World War, a period Gian Carlo Testoni justifiably described in 1946 as “the Negro moment” (“l’ora negra”) in Italian culture. Indications of Italy’s growing interest in and respect for African-American culture were pervasive in the early postwar period. Leone Piccioni argued in a 1947 essay that, in all of American culture, “the greatest originality, the greatest innovation in the relationship between men, is to be found in the participation of the Negroes” (“la massima originalità […], la massima novità dei rapporti tra gli uomini, sta nella presenza dei negri”), and in the same year Giuseppe Ravasio declared African-American literature to be “of the utmost importance” (“di primissima importanza”), while Vinicio Marinucci suggested that African-American writers “have achieved a height of expression equal to that reached by populations with far more ancient traditions” (“hanno raggiunto espressioni di un’altezza pari a quella toccata da altri popoli di assai più antica tradizione”). The following year, Geri Morra proclaimed that “Negroes have entered into world literature” (“[i] negri […] sono entrati nella letteratura mondiale”), Gigi Cane declared African-American music, poetry, narrative, and theater to have contributed “some of the few genuinely original motifs of the young American culture” (“fra i pochi motivi genuinamente originali della giovane cultura americana”), and Alberto Savinio stressed “the importance that Negro culture has had and is having in the culture of our time” (“l’importanza che la cultura negra ha avuto e sta avendo nella cultura del nostro tempo”). In 1949, as admiration for African-American literature spread throughout Italy—cresting like a “wave that washed over our shores with the Allied occupation” (“onda che si riversò sulle nostre rive con l’occupazione alleata”), in the words of Domenico De Robertis—Domenico Mauriello was led to exclaim that “Negro poetry and literature are conquering the sympathy and the interest of the European public” (“[l]a poesia e la letteratura negre vanno di più conquistando le simpatie e l’interesse del pubblico europeo”), Francesco Valori argued that “a history of American literature cannot be considered complete if it does not also consider ‘colored’ writers” (“una storia letteraria americana non può essere completa se non tratta anche degli scrittori ‘colorati’”), and Roberto Leydi concluded that “the originality of American poetry is principally the result of the anonymous contributions of the Negroes” (“[l’]originalità della poesia americana è principalmente affidata alla produzione anonima dei negri”). It is little wonder, then, that Giovanni Battista Angioletti was inspired to affirm in the same year that “the social condition of the American Negroes is, you might say, one of the rallying cries of postwar engagée literature” (“[l]a condizione sociale dei negri d’America è, si può dire, uno dei cavalli di battaglia della letteratura engagée del dopoguerra”). Identifying the political engagement that stood behind the growing Italian interest in the life and culture of blacks in the United States, Angioletti made

---

apparent that the increased attention paid to black writers and intellectuals in Europe had distinct political implications, and he suggested, for this reason, that it should be interpreted within a framework central to developing notions of intellectual impegno.

Angioletti recognized that, in their readings of African-American literature and in their condemnations of America’s racial politics, the intellettuali impegnati were commenting upon and intervening in a European as well as an American cause. They were not only scrutinizing the situation of blacks in the United States, but drawing on it purposefully in order to advance a political argument in Italy. That political argument was often subtle, at times implicit and rarely transparent, but it was forceful nevertheless, and remarkably substantial. It served both to emphasize the shared pathos of the Italian and African-American experiences and to underline what many believed to be the shared objectives of black and Italian activists. Italians were already quite familiar with the plight of African Americans, particularly those in the Jim Crow South: it was “a well-known story” (“una storia che ben conosciamo”), as Cesare Pavese remarked in 1947. Comparing the fate of Italians after the war to that of blacks in the United States was for this reason unquestionably confrontational, a clear attempt to provoke Italians, to force them to recognize the depredations of Fascism and the difficulties of reconstruction. At the same time, such comparisons sought not only to motivate social reform in Italy, but also to interest Italians in the campaign for racial equality in the United States. Describing the African-American resistance to oppression in a language borrowed from the Italian Risorgimento and the anti-Fascist Resistance, Italy’s intellectual leaders indicated that a common moral imperative, a shared compulsion for justice, united the two peoples. Thus, it was often suggested that African Americans were reprising the Italian struggle for liberation and self determination, and Domenico Porzio spoke for many when he declared that plantation songs, spirituals, and the blues were signs that blacks were pursuing their own “Garibaldian freedom” (“garibaldina libertà”). Ultimately, then, what such comparisons were intended to suggest was that blacks and Italians were faced with comparable inequities and should therefore work together to achieve their common ambitions.

It was this sense of shared struggle, for instance, that gave to Italo Calvino’s resonant 1947 review of Richard Wright’s Black Boy its underlying ethical and political charge. Inspired by the recent Italian translation of Wright’s autobiography, which traced the celebrated African-American intellectual’s social formation in the Jim Crow South, Calvino reflected on the revolutionary role of black culture. He argued that, dramatizing the author’s increasing opposition to injustice, Black Boy stood at the vanguard of the “history of a culture that, from a culture of consolation, has become a cultural weapon of defense and of conquest” (“[s]toria di una cultura che da cultura come consolazione, diventa cultura come arma di difesa e di
It is unlikely that his readers would have missed the clear echoes in this statement of Elio Vittorini’s celebrated 1945 call for a new culture in Italy, his “endeavor to give rise to a new culture that would promote the defense rather than the consolation of humanity” (“tentativo di far sorgere una nuova cultura che sia di difesa e non più di consolazione dell’uomo”). Calvino’s appropriation of Vittorini’s terms, underlined by his emphasis on the transition from “consolation” to “defense,” is hardly coincidental. It is evidence, in fact, of his attempt to present African-American culture as a prominent part of a transnational struggle for social renewal. Identifying in Wright, and in African-American culture more broadly, “the emergence of a literature that […] represents […] the rejection of acquiescence and of nostalgia, one which locates its struggle within the context of the great social conflicts” (“il sorgere di una letteratura, che […] rappresenta […] l’abbandono della rassegnazione e della nostalgia per una concezione di lotta nel quadro dei grandi conflitti sociali”), and reinforcing this identification by linking it to Vittorini’s essay, perhaps the best-known statement of postwar Italian impegno, Calvino was implying that, like Italy’s own “new culture,” the work of black American writers was central to the global struggle for justice in the aftermath of the Second World War.

While Calvino emphasized common outcomes, implying that blacks and Italians were pursuing similar goals, many Italian intellectuals put the stress instead on common enemies, arguing that they were fighting against similar forms of oppression and even against a common foe. The theater critic Leonida Rèpaci was among the many to make this case, linking America’s nascent Civil Rights battles to Italy’s ongoing economic reforms in two reviews of the Teatro Pirandello’s 1950 production of Arnaud d’Usseau and James Gow’s play *Deep Are the Roots*. The story of a black American soldier’s fraught return to the segregated South after the completion of his tour of duty in the Second World War, *Deep Are the Roots* revealed to Rèpaci several disturbing parallels between racial oppression in the United States and class-based oppression in Italy. As he saw it, “there is not […] much difference between the plantation owners in the southern United States and the barons in Calabria” (“non c’è […] molta differenza tra i terrieri delle regioni meridionali degli Stati Uniti e i baroni calabresi”). For Rèpaci, that is to say, the latifondisti in the Italian South were comparable to the white landowners in the American South, and peasant laborers in the Italian mezzogiorno were akin to black sharecroppers in the Jim Crow United States. In its dramatic representation of American injustices, therefore, *Deep Are the Roots* could afford new insights into the Italian situation, and Rèpaci sought to underline these insights in his review. Interpreting the play as the sign of a tactical shift in the fight against capitalist exploitation, Rèpaci declared that workers of all races were beginning to recognize that one obstacle, one antagonist stood in their way, and were finally working together against the prevailing social order. As he wrote in his review, “the ‘poor whites’ have understood that their ultimate liberation, in America and worldwide, depends on the solidarity of all of the exploited peoples, white, black and yellow, against the common enemy, against global capitalism” (“il ‘povero bianco’ ha capito che il suo affrancamento totale, in America e in tutto il mondo, dipende dalla solidarietà di tutti gli sfruttati della terra, bianchi, neri,

---

18 Italo Calvino, “Ragazzo negro di Richard Wright,” 1463.
e gialli, contro il nemico comune, contro il capitalismo mondiale”).\(^{19}\) To Rèpaci, in other words, what the play made clear was that shared suffering necessitated a shared struggle. In order to end their collective oppression, blacks and poor Italians would need to join forces against their common oppressor.

While Gow and d’Usseau’s play provided the occasion for his reflections on the African-American situation and its relevance to postwar Italy, Rèpaci made clear that his outlook, especially in regard to the affiliation of race and class, was more ideological than situational. Rèpaci’s interpretation of *Deep Are the Roots*, that is to say, revealed its origins in his Marxist understanding of institutional racism, and in particular in the Soviet adoption of that Marxist paradigm for the analysis of mid-century American politics. Rèpaci found in the play confirmation of a view of the United States that he had first encountered in the Soviet writer Ilya Ehrenburg’s account of his American travels, published in Italian translation in 1947, and that he had subsequently corroborated at the 1948 meeting of the World Congress of Intellectuals for Peace in Wroclaw, Poland, a Soviet-backed gathering intended to galvanize world opinion against American military ambitions.\(^{20}\) Reflecting its Cold-War objectives, the Wroclaw peace conference presented strident critiques not only of American foreign policy, which many of the delegates viewed as the primary threat to world peace, but also of American racism, which many saw as ancillary to capitalist exploitation. Rèpaci recalled, in fact, that among the speeches at the conference there was a forceful “indictment delivered […] by the Negro delegates” (“atto di accusa pronunziato […] dai delegati negri”), which was received with visible commotion by the Assembly, which rose to its feet, an homage that even included the American progressives, who bowed unanimously, acknowledging in this way their own responsibility for the system of racial slavery enacted by the plantation owners of the South. For them, the Negro, whatever he does, even if he covers himself in medals earned in war, is in peacetime allowed only to multiply the riches of his masters; he remains, in this way, an abject being, valued only for the total exploitation of the force of his labor.

vivissima commozione dall’Assemblea in piedi, e, all’omaggio si inchinarono unanimi anche i delegati americani progressisti, i quali così intendevano dividere le loro responsabilità dallo schiavismo razziale dei piantatori del Sud. Per costoro, il negro, qualunque cosa faccia, si copra di medaglie in guerra, serve in pace a


moltiplicare le ricchezze dei suoi padroni, resta un essere abietto buono soltanto per lo sfruttamento intensivo della sua forza-lavoro.21

That Rèpaci would cite this report in his review of *Deep Are the Roots* is telling. It is telling, too, that in his summary of the delegates’ denunciation of racism, Rèpaci insisted on its implications for the class struggle, deploring the economic exploitation of African Americans, whose forced subordination served to deepen class divisions in the United States by subsidizing whites and ensuring the proletarization of blacks. Analyzing Gow and d’Usseau’s play and its indictment of American racism in this way, Rèpaci was unmistakably adopting the Soviet line, in which opposition to racial exploitation in America was one aspect of a larger campaign against global economic exploitation, one front in the battle for Communism worldwide.22

Institutional racism in the United States, in fact, had long been a focus of Soviet attention. Not only had Lenin addressed the so-called “Negro Question” at the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920, but the Fourth Congress, in 1922, had led to the formation of a Negro Commission in order to encourage the global struggle against racism within the larger struggle against capitalism. The Commission’s “Theses on the Negro Question” declared that racial oppression was a form of economic oppression and called for African Americans to supplant their notions of racial solidarity with class-consciousness, taking up the fight for international Communism.23 At its core, their argument was that American institutional racism conspired to keep blacks in a position of inferiority both socially and economically, and thus to ensure the continued presence of a class below that of the poorest whites. In this way, racism effectively purchased white support for capitalism, providing even the poorest of white citizens with “a sort of public and psychological wage,” as W. E. B. DuBois argued, granting them social if not economic advantages over blacks and thereby allowing them to feel part of the ruling class even when they remained decidedly working class. Thus, it was believed, poor whites were led to align themselves with the wealthy in what Joel Olson calls “a cross-class alliance between the capitalist class and a section of the working class” rather than uniting with African-Americans in the sort of cross-race alliance through which they might more effectively pursue economic equality.24 In this interpretation, racism ultimately served to perpetuate capitalism. Many

---

believed, therefore, that to combat racism one needed to instill class consciousness in blacks and poor whites, to help them recognize their common enemies and their common ambitions, and, in the words of Leonida Rèpaci, to promote the “solidarity of all of the exploited peoples.” Rèpaci’s particular contribution to this tendency lay in his claim that, as an oppressed underclass, African Americans bore a particular resemblance to poor southern Italians, and therefore that it was the duty and destiny of all Italians to unite with the blacks in their fight for equality. This claim, then, imbued his vision of “solidarity,” his impegno nero, with a national as well as an international resonance.

Not only Rèpaci, but in fact many prominent Italian intellectuals espoused such a view, framing America’s racial conflict as a class conflict and calling for a cross-racial class consciousness in order to foment a global, as well as a specifically Italian, resistance movement. Among the most forceful advocates of this position was Giuseppe Del Bo, who argued in a 1948 essay in Avanti!, provocatively entitled “Dinamite negra” (“Black Dynamite”), that African Americans represented the vanguard in a struggle for justice that was European as well as American, and that the emerging black resistance could thus serve to explode the European consensus and to overturn the prevailing political order worldwide. “The Negroes have by now clearly identified the cause of their moral and material misfortune, and have gone on the offensive” (“[I] negri, hanno ormai chiaramente individuato le cause della loro miseria morale e materiale, e sono passati all’offensiva”), Del Bo explained, while

[i]n Europe, […] instead of a race, we have a class that is kept in a position of inferiority, and we know well how similar its general psychosis is to that identified in Negroes. And yet the moment always arises when a man of the race or the class that is considered inferior asks himself: ‘Why must I serve while they are served? Why am I poor and they are rich?’

[i]n Europa […] invece di una razza, abbiamo una classe mantenuta in uno stato di inferiorità, e sappiamo bene come la sua psicosi generale sia simile a quella descritta a proposito dei negri. Eppure giunge sempre il momento in cui un uomo della razza o della classe considerate inferiori, si chiede: ‘Perché io devo servire e loro sono serviti? Perché io sono povero e loro sono ricchi?’.

Not only were blacks in the United States and workers in Europe both victims of oppression and exploitation, Del Bo was arguing, they were also both increasingly outspoken in their opposition to that exploitation, and they could therefore help to reinforce each other’s efforts to overturn the systems of oppression. Suggesting that black resistance to racism could prefigure, and parallel,
European resistance to capitalism, in other words, Del Bo was proposing the fight for racial equality in the United States as a trigger for a worldwide workers’ revolution, expressing his hope that European workers might follow the African-American lead and begin to emerge from the “position of inferiority” in which they had been kept. The *impegno nero* made manifest in Del Bo’s essay, as in Rèpaci’s reviews, is perhaps best understood, therefore, as a prominent Italian example of a broader European tendency, one which drew inspiration from Marxist principles and Soviet strategy and incorporated Italian and African-American reform movements within a global framework.

While this ideological backdrop undoubtedly helped to shape the Italian reception of black culture, it is nonetheless evident that the rhetoric of *impegno nero* owed at least as much to the domestic politics and local experiences of wartime and postwar Italy as it did to such international developments. One crucial factor in shaping Italians’ unique engagement with the African-American struggle, for example, was the presence in Italy of large numbers of black soldiers both during and after the war. It was in Italy, after all, that the celebrated Buffalo Division of the 92nd Infantry was deployed, becoming the first black unit to fight in Europe when they landed in Naples in July 1944. Many of these soldiers remained in Italy during the postwar occupation, and the interchanges and associations prompted by the resulting close contact between African-Americans and Italians were frequently instructive, helping to spread cultural understanding and to reinforce political sympathies. For instance, Arrigo Benedetti, who would go on to launch the influential journals *L’Europeo* and *Espresso*, reported on a 1945 dinner he shared with soldiers of the Buffalo Division, where he was first introduced to Negro spirituals. A seemingly minor episode, perhaps, but such exchanges helped both to popularize African-American music and literature and to familiarize Italians with African-American social concerns. Their impact was apparent to Walter White, future head of the NAACP, who spent parts of 1944 and 1945 touring Italy as a war correspondent for the *New York Post*, and who was continually struck by Italians’ warm reception of the black soldiers. Many in Italy, White recalled, “learned from firsthand acquaintance that among the Negro soldiers were men of culture and education.” Moreover, since these soldiers often went out of their way to provide impoverished Italians with food, in White’s telling, this “inevitably created an inordinate amount of good will for the Negro benefactors and for Negroes generally among the recipients of their benefactions.” Gratitude for the assistance of black soldiers, White made clear, went hand in hand with an appreciation of black culture, an awareness of the fraught racial dynamics of American society, and increasing support for African Americans in their campaign for justice.

Unsurprisingly, therefore, *impegno nero* was often explicitly framed as a result of and response to the spirit of “good will” that White identified. This is apparent, for example, in the reflections of the poet Giorgio Caproni, whose 1949 essay “I negri sono uomini” (“The Negroes are Men”) recalls the arrival of African-American soldiers in Italy and asserts that blacks and Italians had met each other with “mutual enthusiasm” (“reciproca esaltazione”). This appreciative reception, Caproni explained, “[w]as, in its abjection, a manifestation of love, (of offended people) drawn towards other offended people, with shared wonder, and for this reason we Italians are now attempting to understand our brothers of a different color in a more worthy

fashion” (“[f]u un fenomeno, nella sua abiezione, di ‘amore’, [di] offesi mossi verso altri offesi, con reciproco abbaglio], e anche per questo cerchiamo ora, noi italiani, di conoscere in modo degno questi nostri fratelli di differente colore”). That is to say, Caproni maintained that the new and profound Italian interest in American-African culture resulted from the relationships formed between blacks and Italians in wartime. Moreover, he stressed that those relationships carried with them a social obligation, arguing that Italians were duty-bound to support African Americans in their struggle for Civil Rights just as they themselves had been supported by African Americans in the fight against Fascism. In Caproni’s words, encountering black soldiers amidst the rubble of the Second World War the Italians were “offended people drawn towards other offended people,” victims united with other victims: cognizant of their own misfortunes, they were sensitive to the misfortunes of African Americans. While Italy’s fortunes were changing, moreover, the plight of African Americans was ongoing. Black soldiers had freed Italians from Fascist oppression, but they themselves remained oppressed, and mired in their own bloody battle for freedom. Caproni thus insisted that Italians should seek to contribute to the struggle against racism in the United States just as African Americans had contributed to the struggle against Fascism in Italy. As Caproni envisioned it, then, impegno nero necessarily followed from the encounter with black soldiers in Italy, which both precipitated the postwar Italian dissemination of African-American culture and commited Italians to the fight for racial equality in the United States.

If impegno nero was partly the result of wartime interactions, however, it was also the outgrowth of prewar convictions. While the increasing popularity of African-American literature after the war was certainly precipitous, in other words, it was by no means spontaneous. The efforts of some of Italy’s leading young interwar intellectuals had prepared the ground on which the new culture would grow after 1945. Indeed, impegno nero is unimaginable, and largely incomprehensible, without the profound investment in American literature that had characterized the previous two decades of Italian culture. This is because impegno nero effectively revived and revised the mito dell’America that Elio Vittorini, Cesare Pavese, and the other young Italian intellectuals often collectively called the americanisti had helped to develop between the World Wars. This American mythology, which coalesced around Vittorini’s monumental 1941
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anthology *Americana*, presented American literature as a means not only to renew Italian literature but also to renew Italy itself. Like the advocates of *impegno nero*, in other words, Vittorini, Pavese and the *americanisti* conjoined their political convictions with their cultural interests. Translating and celebrating American literature during the Fascist *ventennio*, they opposed the prevailing tendencies in Italian culture and imagined an American alternative. If a commitment to the fight against racism and the concomitant diffusion of African-American literature was a characteristic form of postwar *impegno nero*, then the commitment to the fight against Fascism and the concomitant adoption of American realist literature was similarly a characteristic form of interwar *impegno*.

As such, the *mito dell’America* of the 1930s provides needed perspective on *impegno nero* and its characteristic investment in African-American and Italian social issues. Primarily, I believe, what both tendencies share is their self-reflective modes of interpretation, their use of analogy and even allegory to couch their rhetoric of *impegno* in transnational rather than exclusively local social critiques. *Impegno nero* emphasized the Italian connotations of the African-American struggle just as the *mito dell’America* emphasized the Italian connotations of American social realism. In both cases, those connotations derived from a specific set of approaches to the text. That is to say, both the pre- and the postwar tendencies were defined by their appropriation of a reformist ideology and rhetoric that had originated in American literature, and this appropriation was arrived at by establishing correspondences between American and Italian social conditions. Re-contextualization and re-interpretation were thus crucial steps in both political operations. Yet, especially in the case of the *mito dell’America*, this fact has often been overlooked. The Fascist government’s official policy of cultural autarky and its increasingly bellicose attitude toward the United States led many to suggest that the translation and dissemination of American literature under Fascism was an inherently political act, as if the very introduction of American writers into the Italian context was an act of defiance, a mode of dissent. Scholars have now largely rejected this interpretation as a “comforting illusion” or a “historical distortion.” Having ceased to draw rigid distinctions between the anti-Americanism of Fascist intellectuals and the anti-Fascism of the *americanisti*, historians now stress the ambivalent image of America in Fascist Italy, noting that even some of those closest to...
the Mussolini regime celebrated American culture while, on the contrary, some of those opposed to the regime also at times opposed America’s cultural and political influence. For this and other reasons, translations of American literature were rarely censored and were in fact frequently seen, and made, to conform to Fascism’s own cultural project. One could not portray Italians negatively, for example, or offend “Fascist morality,” and, as Francesca Billiani explains, “foreign texts had always to be compared with the example set by the canonical Italian literary tradition.” Within these limits, however, translation was encouraged, becoming so prevalent that, measured in numbers of pages, foreign translations outstripped Italian texts in Fascist Italy. The act of translation did not, therefore, in and of itself, constitute an act of opposition, nor did the idealization of America necessarily imply or entail a condemnation of Fascism.

It is certainly true that Vittorini and Pavese’s translations of American literature were adopted by generations of left-wing intellectuals, both because they were believed to have constituted an intervention against Fascist ideology and because they served to motivate many of their readers to engage in further acts of opposition. It is also true, however, that translation itself cannot account for the political significance of the mito dell’America. Instead, the myth’s oppositional imperative should be understood to reside in its appropriation of American social critiques in order to criticize Italian society. As many scholars have come to believe, in other words, the importance of the American mythology was a function not of what Italian intellectuals read—both Fascists and anti-Fascists could and did read American literature, after all—but rather of how they read. Fascist writers tended to present an absolute separation between American social critiques and Italian society so that, in Billiani’s words, the Fascist regime “did not block, but transformed, the foreign influx” (“non bloccò, ma travestì, l’ingresso dello straniero”). Providing an example of how this worked in practice, Jane Dunnett has shown how the 1940 Italian translation of John Steinbeck’s novel In Dubious Battle was presented as a stinging critique of American inequality, but one explicitly declared not to apply to Italy, “a country where the class struggle, as understood by Steinbeck, no longer exists” (“un paese dove le lotte di classe, nel senso inteso dallo Steinbeck, non esistono più”), as the work’s Italian preface affirmed. In contrast, Vittorini, Pavese, and the americanisti seized upon and championed many literary works that offered a critical vision of American society precisely
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because that critique could be made in turn to apply to their own situation in Italy. In texts such as *In Dubious Battle*, Erskine Caldwell’s *Tobacco Road*, John Dos Passos’s *U.S.A.* trilogy, Theodore Dreiser’s *An American Tragedy*, Edgar Lee Masters’s *Spoon River Anthology*, and Sinclair Lewis’s *Babbit*—texts which satirized American attitudes, pilloried American culture, and condemned American injustices—the *americanisti* discovered a critical outlook that they could apply to interwar Italy.\(^{37}\) Seeing the United States as an allegory for universal experience, they were able to find in American literature not a critique of American society alone, but rather of all societies, and of Italian society in particular. America was, for Vittorini, a “type of universal literature in one language” (“specie di letteratura universale ad una lingua sola”).\(^{38}\) For Pavese, “America was not another country, a new historical beginning, but rather a giant theater in which the collective drama was performed more openly than elsewhere” (“l’America non era un altro paese, un nuovo inizio della storia, ma soltanto il gigantesco teatro dove con maggiore franchezza che altrove veniva recitato il dramma di tutti”).\(^{39}\) Thus, as Giaime Pintor declared in an essay published posthumously in 1945, for the *americanisti* “[t]his America has no need of Columbus, it is discovered within us, it is the land to which we turn with the same hope as the first emigrants and the same faith as those determined to defend the dignity of the human condition even at the cost of exhaustion and error” (“[q]uesta America non ha bisogno di Colombo, essa è scoperta dentro di noi, è la terra a cui si tende con la stessa speranza e la stessa fiducia dei primi emigranti e di chiunque sia deciso a difendere a prezzo di fatiche e di errori la dignità della condizione umana”).\(^{40}\) Understood allegorically, then, America could represent Italy, and the critiques mounted by American writers against their own society could be brought to bear on Italian social problems. The universalizing, allegorical, and self-reflective mode of reading American literature that characterized the *mito dell’America* thus became central to the oppositional stance adopted by Italian intellectuals as they sought to project a new Italian society after Fascism.

My contention is that the very same mode of interpretation underwrites *impegno nero*, which should therefore be understood to have reprimed and advanced Italy’s earlier *mito dell’America*. Scholars have tended instead, however, to speak of a postwar rupture with prewar *americanismo* or an “end of the myth of America,” which is said to have occurred between 1947 and 1950, precisely the years that witnessed the intensification of *impegno nero*.\(^{41}\) To be sure,
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these claims regarding the decline of the American mythology are not entirely unfounded. In the preface to the 1948 re-publication of his novel *Il garofano rosso*, after all, Elio Vittorini had made clear that he had been mistaken in his longstanding advocacy of American literature because “we had thought that, with the help of American innovations, we could have entered into poetic maturity and into a poetic tradition of the novel. But it was not that. It was still adolescence” (“si pensava che attraverso l’aiuto della freschezza americana si sarebbe forse entrati in una maturità poetica e in una tradizione poetica del romanzo. Ma non era questo. Era ancora adolescenza”). What is more, in May 1947 Cesare Pavese had made an even more forceful repudiation of his own American mythology: “The period in which we discovered America is over” (“Sono finiti i tempi in cui scoprivamo l’America”), Pavese announced during a RAI broadcast that many scholars cite as the end of the American myth, “and we can predict that for some decades nothing more will come from that nation to rival the names and the revelations that enthralled our prewar youth” (“e si può prevedere che per qualche decennio non ci verrà più da quel popolo nulla di simile ai nomi e alle rivelazioni che entusiasmarono la nostra giovinezza prebellica”). I argue, however, that despite appearances, Vittorini’s declaration and even Pavese’s broadcast were part of a reformation and renewal of the *mito dell’America*, rather than a rejection.

Indeed, I believe that *impegno nero* effectively took over where the *mito dell’America* had left off. In this regard, it is significant, and worth parsing, that the RAI broadcast in which Pavese gave voice to his supposed break with American literature was devoted to a discussion of the Italian translation of Richard Wright’s *Black Boy*. While emphasizing the stagnation of American culture, Pavese remarked on that occasion upon the African-American author’s literary innovations, suggesting that his “verbal tools […] have served him marvelously” (“mezzi verbali […] gli hanno servito a meraviglia”), and placing him within the “tradition of great narrative prose” (“tradizione della grande prosa narrativa”). In short, Pavese identified Wright as the vital center of an otherwise outmoded American tradition. Several months before Pavese’s radio address, moreover, Vittorini had reached the same conclusion, arguing that, while American literature appeared to be stagnating, there was nonetheless a “recent development” (“ultima novità”) to be found in the work of writers like “Richard Wright, who are the children of races that have been persecuted or humiliated, or merely tolerated, […] bastards in comparison with the group that dominates American society” (“che sono figli delle razze perseguitate o umiliate, o appena tollerate, […] bastardi rispetto al ceppo umano che domina nella società d’oltre Atlantico”). If it is true, therefore, that the Italian discovery of American literature peaked
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before the Second World War, as Pavese asserted in his radio broadcast and Vittorini asserted in
his preface, it is not at all the case that American authors and movements had ceased entirely to
inspire the coming generations of Italian writers, nor that the myth of America in Italy had
reached its conclusion.

In fact, drawing on African-American literature and appropriating African-American
critiques of the United States, Pavese and Vittorini were at the forefront of postwar impegno
nero, not only joining, but in many senses leading the effort to renew the model that they had
established with the prewar mito dell’America. Their characteristic approach, in which the
interpretation of American literature served to advance a critique of Italian society, is apparent in
Pavese’s emphasis on what he believed to be Italians’ growing sympathy for Richard Wright’s
descriptions of the “daily hunger masked with mouthfuls of water, or the blinding fear that the
whites, the ‘enemies’, unrestrained, will organize a lynching” (“fame quotidiana ingannata
ingozzandosi d’acqua o del cieco terrore che i bianchi, i ‘nemici’, si scatenino e organizzino un
linciaggio”). This sympathy, Pavese suggested, was a direct result of Italy’s experiences during
the war.

Is there anyone among us, any white person, who has not stared hunger and racial
terror in the face, and who can swear that tomorrow these specters will not return?
This is the message, the truest word, of Black Boy. The authentic and suffered
fruit of human sorrow and fortune that concerns all of us.

C’è qualcuno di noi, qualche bianco, che non abbia visto in faccia la fame e il
terrore razziale, che possa giurare che domani questi spettri non risorgeranno? È
questo il messaggio, la parola più vera di Ragazzo negro [the Italian title of
Wright’s Black Boy]. Il frutto autentico e sofferto di un’umana sofferenza e
avventura, che ci concerne tutti quanti.46

In Black Boy, Wright described the perils of an African-American childhood in Mississippi,
Arkansas, and Tennessee. For Pavese, however, the systematic persecution of blacks in the Jim
Crow South was analogous to that which many Italians had experienced under Fascism, the Nazi
occupation, and the fight for liberation. He argued, therefore, that Wright’s account had taken on
added significance for Italian readers after the Second World War, having come to signify, to
exemplify, and to amplify their inchoate responses to the horrors of war.

The same mode of interpretation, the same endeavor to discover in African-American
literature analogies to the Italian experience, is evident in the postwar essays of Elio Vittorini. As
early as December 1945, in fact, Vittorini argued that the racism, poverty, and violence decried
by much African-American literature were mirrored in the Italian war-time experience. In an
Atlanta,” Vittorini explained that:

Atlanta is famous, amongst American cities, for a massacre of Negroes that was
carried out there. This ‘Litany at Atlanta’ refers to that fact. But its writer wished

46 Cesare Pavese, “Richard Wright,” 171.
for it to refer to the daily suffering of Negroes in America. We are publishing it because it can refer to us. Poetry is poetry for this reason; it does not remain bound to the circumstances from which it has arisen and, if it is born from pain, it can refer to all pain. If for no other reasons than hunger, cold and disappointment, could not millions of Europeans today unite their voices to this *old Negro song*?

Atlanta è famosa, tra le città americane, per un massacro di negri che vi fu compiuto. Questa ‘Litania di Atlanta’ si riferisce a quel fatto. Ma chi la scrisse volle riferirla alle sofferenze d’ogni giorno del popolo negro in America. Noi la pubblichiamo perché possiamo riferirla anche a noi. La poesia è per questo poesia; perché non resta legata alle cose da cui ha avuto origine e si può riferirla, se nasce da dolore ad ogni dolore. Quanti milioni di europei non potrebbero, oggi unire le loro voci, non fosse altro che per fame, freddo e delusione, a questo vecchio canto dei negri d’America?47

Vittorini thus sought to universalize, or rather to Italianize, the event recounted by Du Bois, the September 1906 Atlanta Race Riot in which thousands of whites attacked hundreds of blacks, murdering dozens. Arguing that, despite the poem’s historical specificity, “it can refer to us,” Vittorini implied that America’s racism and segregation were akin to the oppression and suffering of Italians, that the black experience had become a collective experience. Having been made familiar with racially-motivated mob violence, Vittorini argued, Europeans could now understand, with first-hand knowledge, events like those recounted in Du Bois’s poem. Just as Pavese suggested that racism and racial violence were examples of a kind of suffering that, in the wake of the Second World War, “concerns all of us,” in other words, so too did Vittorini argue that “millions of Europeans” could now identify with the victims of race hatred in Atlanta. Not only that, but those same Europeans could also begin to join with African Americans in protesting their condition and fighting for change.

Vittorini’s invocation of this united struggle against oppression, his call for Europeans to “unite their voices to this *old Negro song*,” is one of the clearest expressions both of *impegno nero* after the war and of the underlying sentiments of the interwar *mito dell’America*. Reflecting on that interwar myth as it had been elaborated by Vittorini and Pavese, Italo Calvino argued that “America was an enormous allegory for our problems, for us, the Italians of that time, for our evil and our good, for our conservatism and for our need for rebellion” (“l’America era una gigantesca allegoria dei problemi nostri, di noi italiani d’allora, del nostro male e del nostro bene, del nostro conservatorismo e del nostro bisogno di ribellione”).48 The postwar myth, with its emphasis on the African-American experience, similarly presented an “enormous allegory,” offering a vision of the protracted efforts to right the wrongs of Fascism, to meet the challenges of reconstruction, and to remake Italy after the war, and grounding that vision in a symbolic reading of African-American literature. The anthologies celebrating African-American writers, the essays affirming their originality and virtuosity, the new literary histories giving pride of
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place to the black experience, all reinforced the transformation, rather than the abandonment, of the *mito dell’America* as it had been formulated in the 1930s. Like the *americanisti* before them, these texts make clear, the advocates of *impegno nero* found in America a provocation for change and a model for reform. In their writings, the African-American experience became the new “universal literature,” the new “giant theater,” the new “myth of America,” and *impegno nero* was defined and empowered by this attempted allegoresis, by the efforts of Italian intellectuals to transmute their sympathetic reading of African-American literature into a corrective intervention in Italian society. Interpreting the work of black writers, they were also working to transform Italian society; denouncing American racism, they were also condemning Italy’s own failures. Like the *mito dell’America*, therefore, *impegno nero* was characterized by its mode of interpretation, its efforts to discern and to display Italy’s shortcomings by appropriating social critiques that had originated in American literature.

The innovation of *impegno nero* lay not in the *fact* of reading African-American writers, that is to say, but rather in the *act* of interpretation, in the self-reflective and self-critical hermeneutic with which postwar Italian intellectuals approached the text. This point requires particular emphasis, because neither the interest in African-American literature nor the criticism of American racism were themselves developments of the postwar period. Indeed, in Fascist Italy the work of black writers had been both surprisingly prevalent and remarkably esteemed. Contrary to expectations, perhaps, Italian commentators had been allowed to devote significant attention to African-American culture relatively unimpeded throughout the Fascist *ventennio*, and African-American writers, artists, musicians, and actors had been received seriously and with great interest, attracting popular, critical, and academic recognition in Mussolini’s Italy. Already in 1925, for instance, Arnaldo Cipolla had used an account of his travels *Nell’America del Nord* to argue that, artistically speaking, blacks in the United States were superior to whites.49 Assessing the Harlem Renaissance, “La rinascita negra,” in *La Stampa* in 1926, Aldo Sorani cited Alan Locke’s *The New Negro* and the writings of W. E. B. DuBois as evidence that African-American literature was on the rise.50 In her 1929 analysis of the *Vita Americana*, Irene Di Robilant praised the work of Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Countee Cullen, and Claude McKay.51 Franco Ciarlantini also commented favorably on Dunbar, Cullen, and McKay, as well as DuBois, and Langston Hughes in his 1934 chronicle *Roma-Nuova York e ritorno*.52 And, citing these same five authors, Emilio Cecchi extolled African-American literature in his otherwise quite critical and jaundiced 1939 account of culture and society in the United States, *America amara*.53 Under Fascism, moreover, readers could encounter not only critical acclamations but also Italian translations of many important works of African-American literature. Claude McKay’s *Home to Harlem* and Zora Neale Hurston’s *Their Eyes Were Watching God* were among the works by black authors published in translation during the Fascist *ventennio*, and in the same period the journals *Circoli, Letteratura*, and *L’Orto* hosted works by black poets including Cullen, Dunbar, Hughes, McKay, Gwendolyn Bennett, Joseph Seamon Cotter Jr., Waring Cuney, Georgia

51 Irene di Robilant, *Vita americana (Stati Uniti del Nord-America)* (Turin: Fratelli Rocca Editori, 1929), 386-7.
Douglas Johnson, and James Weldon Johnson.\(^{54}\) In many respects, intellectuals under Fascism were as interested in African-American literature, and as outspoken in the criticisms of American racism, as were their counterparts after the war, and this must necessarily undermine any straightforward opposition between pre- and postwar treatments of these themes.

Instead, as was the case with the *mito dell’America*, the difference should be seen to lie in how the themes were treated, how they were interpreted, and what conclusions they were asked to support. Under Fascism, criticisms of American racism were frequently transfigured in such a way as to advance the Fascist cause. Paradoxically, therefore, the racist policies of the Fascist regime often coexisted with, and were even reinforced by, denunciations of the racist policies of the United States.\(^{55}\) Fascist-era travel writing, newspaper reporting, literature and literary histories, films and film criticism, and even Fascist propaganda, all presented strident but compromised critiques of the injustice of American racism.\(^{56}\) In his 1928 account of the *Vita
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d’America, Arnaldo Fraccaroli recounted with a tone of horror and disgust the existence in the South of “extraordinary laws […] which take from Negroes their most important electoral rights” (“speciali leggi […] che tolgono ai negri i più importanti diritti elettorali”), and lamented as well that in the North “the board of education prevents Negro children from attending white schools” (“il board of education impedisce ai ragazzi negri di frequentare le scuole dei bianchi”). In Vita Americana, Irene di Robilant expressed her belief that, despite Americans’ claims to the contrary, “racial persecution persists and […] race hatred shows little sign of extinction” (“la persecuzione persista tuttora e […] l’odio di razza tardi molto a spegnersi”). Even a staunch Fascist like Franco Ciarlantini, who represented the Fascist Party (PNF) in parliament and wrote volumes in praise of Hitler, Mussolini, and Italian colonial expansion in Africa, was among those to oppose American racism, denouncing in his 1929 Incontro col Nord America what he called “the brutal suppression of a race, beyond all legal limits, by means of intimidation” (“la brutale sovrapposizione di una razza, mantenuta coll’intimidimento, al di fuori di ogni legalità”). Examples of such evident contradictions abound. Italian commentators who overlooked or even approved of Italy’s Race Laws often claimed to be appalled by American racism.

They condemned in particular what Emilio Cecchi called the “diabolical dementia” (“diabolica demenza”) of American lynch mobs. In an article entitled “3200 linciaggi e un progetto parlamentare [3200 Lynchings and a Parliamentary Project],” first published in the Corriere della Sera in 1938 and then included in America amara, Cecchi sought to provide a graphic illustration of the reality behind the shocking statistic with which he opened his account—the claim that “between 1882 and 1937 more than 5110 people were lynched in the United States” (“[dal] 1882 al 1937 furono linciati agli Stati Uniti oltre 5110 persone”)—and told of the horror and the injustice of a 1934 lynching in Florida for which, despite hundreds of eyewitnesses, there was “no clue pointing to the guilty, no arrest” (“nessun indizio di colpevoli, nessun arresto”). In a 1933 article on “L’invasione negra” (“The Negro Invasion”), Amerigo Ruggiero reported on “[t]he lynchings, the torture, the cannibal cruelty inflicted on Negroes, who are burned alive in broad daylight in the crowded squares of the cities most infected by the fanaticism of racial superiority” (“[i] linciaggi, le torture, le crudeltà da cannibali applicate ai negri, arsi vivi in pieno giorno nelle piazze affollate dei centri più infetti dal fanatismo della supremazia di razza”). In a 1939 article offering the shocking assertion that “[a]t least two Negroes are lynched in America every day” (“[a]lmeno due negri al giorno vengono linciati in America”), Carlo Bruni explained to his Italian readers that, while lynching may seem a barbaric remnant of the distant past, with its spectacle of a black man’s “slow death, after torment and torture which, if recounted, would elicit a sense of horror, sending shivers up your spine [morte lenta, dopo strazi e torture, il cui solo racconto guasta il sangue e suscita un senso d’orrore”), it
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was, in fact, anything but: “[l]ynching is a relatively recent institution. It is a creation of our age, and not even the most optimistic can delude themselves into believing that, sooner or later, it will disappear” (“[i]l linciaggio è un’istituzione relativamente recente. Appartiene ai giorni nostri; e nemmeno i più ottimisti s’illudono di poter assistere, prima o poi, alla sua scomparsa”). Such criticisms are often no less valid, nor less affecting, than those put forward after the Second World War. What is striking, however, is that, whereas the postwar engagement with the African-American struggle was intimately linked with Italian efforts to counteract the influence of Fascism and to reform the nation after the Second World War, this earlier engagement coexisted with the very principles of Fascism that postwar intellectuals would most oppose.

Indeed, the efforts to underline the problems of race in the United States and to garner sympathy for the plight of African Americans were in many ways central to Fascist self-justification. Italian colonialism, for instance, was frequently justified through references to what Fascist intellectuals believed to be the far worse crimes committed against blacks in the United States. Thus Giacomo Ebner, in an *Inchiesta sulla schiavitù* [Investigation of Slavery] commissioned in 1928 by the Italian governing authority in Tripoli, explained that “in the territories under our dominion slavery does not exist in any form” (“nei territori soggetti al nostro diretto dominio non esiste la schiavitù in nessuna forma”), and that blacks under Italian rule were in fact treated quite well, in contrast to the “truly bestial treatment of the Negro by the English colonizers in America, so effectively described, without pretense, in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*” [davvero bestiale trattamento del negro da parte dei coloni inglesi in America, così efficacemente descritto, in veste senza pretese, nella ‘Capanna dello zio Tom’”). Emphasizing that, “in the United States the ‘racial barrier’ is constantly raised before the eyes of people of color, and particularly the Negro” (“[n]egli Stati Uniti la ‘barriera di razza’ si eleva ad ogni istante innanzi agli occhi dell’uomo di colore, e particolarmente del negro”), Ebner called attention to what he saw as the more equitable and just organization of the Italian colonies, arguing that

between the status of the Negro in the United States of America and that of the Negro in the pre-desert regions of Gheriat and Uadi Esc-Sciati there are profound differences, which are by no means to the favor of that rich and boundless land often claimed to be the place where the individual enjoys the greatest freedom on Earth.
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fra la posizione del negro negli Stati Uniti d’America e quella del negro nelle zone predesertiche del Gheriát e dello Sciati vi sono differenze profonde, tuttavia non nel senso favorevole a quella ricca e sconfinata terra ch’è pure designata come il luogo del mondo ove l’individuo gode la più ampia libertà.\textsuperscript{64}

Similarly, in a 1940 study of “Razzismo negli Stati Uniti” (“Racism in the United States”) offered as part of a conference on the “Politica fascista della razza”—a summit devoted to the defense and promotion of Fascist racism—Luigi Villari argued that, as a result of American racism, it was reasonable to “cast some doubt on the value of Americans’ frequent criticism of those European countries that have found it necessary to enact policies of a racist nature” (“gettare qualche dubbio sul valore delle critiche che gli Americani sogliono muovere a quei paesi europei che hanno ritenuto necessario emanare misure di carattere razzista”).\textsuperscript{65} This was a common refrain in Fascist discourse, and Ebner and Villari were among the many supporters of Italian Fascism to decry American racism as part of a defense or justification of the policies of the Fascist regime.

Moreover, as the hostility between Italy and the United States steadily increased, Italian newspapers exploited accounts of American racism to serve as propaganda, seeking to motivate feelings of enmity toward the United States by drawing upon the large and ready reserve of critical sentiment regarding the country’s racial inequalities. In \textit{La Stampa}, for example, a 1941 article framed the impending American intervention as an outgrowth of American racism, stressing that race hatred, which had “begun with the Negroes” (“cominciato con i negri”), was now spreading, that “[e]very American holds within his heart his own particular aversion towards people of another creed, another color, another origin” (“ognuno nutre nel proprio seno la sua particolare avversione contro persone di un altro credo, di un altro colore, di un’altra origine”).\textsuperscript{66} In 1942, an article asserting that “England is looking for workers and America for cannon fodder” (“L’Inghilterra cerca operai e l’America carne da cannone”) argued that, even as white Americans were seeking to “cajole Negroes so that they will enlist” (“blandire i negri finché servono”), they did not hesitate to “mistreat them and lynch them whenever they like and whenever it is convenient” (“maltrattarli e linciarli quando fa comodo e piacere”). Another, arguing that “The persecution of Negroes continues unabated in America” (“La persecuzione contro i negri continua implacabile in America”), made clear that “war has not extinguished the vicious persecution of which American Negroes are the victims, however much the government has sought to garner for the war effort the contributions of people of color” (“[l]a guerra non ha spento la feroce persecuzione di cui sono vittime i negri degli Stati Uniti, quantunque il governo abbia sollecitato l’apporto bellico della popolazione di colore”).\textsuperscript{67} Article after article emphasized that African Americans were victims of their country’s “vicious persecution,”

\textsuperscript{64} Giacomo Ebner, \textit{Inchiesta sulla schiavitù} (Rome: Società italiana arti grafiche editrice, 1940), 15, 21, 48. The title page of Ebner’s study refers to the work as a “relazione circa l’inchiesta sulla schiavitù in Tripolitania, eseguita nel febbraio 1928 d’ordine delle Autorità governative e giudiziarie di Tripoli.”


mistreated by the government they were enlisting to defend and hated by the citizens they were working to protect. In their sheer number, as well as in their shocking details, these articles led, as if inexorably, to a larger conclusion: the America they reveal is not only a hateful nation, characterized by violence, injustice, and belligerence, but also an enemy nation, opposed to Italian values and incompatible with Italian society. Accumulating and emphasizing reports of American racism, that is to say, Fascist-era newspapers successfully stigmatized the United States and reinforced Italian opposition to American interests. Indeed, inspiring compassion for African Americans, the newspapers sought to inspire support for the Italian war effort. They condemned American racism insofar as it served this cause, but no further.

Noted writers of the Fascist period criticized American racism, sympathized with the plight of African Americans, and championed important works of African-American literature. What they did not do, however, was undertake any self-critique in light of their celebration of black culture and criticisms of American racism. If anything, their criticisms served to pre-empt self-reflection and to spare Italians from any admonishment. Carlo Bruni’s point in emphasizing the “sense of horror” he felt in learning of the torture and lynching of African Americans, after all, was that the American government’s continuing tolerance of these racially-motivated attacks made its criticism of Italy’s racial policies inherently suspect.

America at times presumes to stand at the pulpit and to lecture old Europe. There is an entire philanthropic rhetoric, wordy and mannered, puritanical, *Made in the U.S.A.*, destined for export and accepted abroad with great reverence. Rhetoric that emerges from a country which lynch a couple of Negroes each day. Rhetoric that fails to explain, however, that these summary executions are the consequence of an entrenched system and the crude revelation of a people’s mentality.

L’America a volte pretende di salire in cattedra per dare lezioni alla vecchia Europa. Esiste tutta una retorica filantropica, verbosa e di maniera, puritaneggiante, made in U.S.A., destinata alla esportazione ed accettata altrove, a volte con reverenza. Una retorica che parte dal paese che lincia un paio di negri al giorno. Una retorica che però non ci spiega che queste esecuzioni sommarie sono la conseguenza d’un sistema radicato e la cruda rivelazione della mentalità di tutto un popolo.  

In light of its legally enforced racial inequalities and frequent explosions of racist violence, Bruni argued, the United States forfeited the right to reproach Europeans or to instruct them on the proper conduct toward those of other races. Emilio Cecchi, too, was led to question the validity of the American government’s attacks on Italian racism, arguing that

American hedonism and utilitarianism are mirrored in the infinite aspects of the racial problem. Sympathy and solidarity for the German and Italian Jews, so long as it serves the arguments in favor of democracy. And suspicion and guerilla

warfare against the Jews of Wall Street whenever financial advantage is at stake. Ardent love for Ethiopian Negroes. And obstruction [...] of the efforts to pass laws against lynching: laws that American Negroes would certainly have liked.

Cecchi was undoubtedly justified in highlighting the political machinations behind America’s opposition to racism abroad. The stance adopted by the United States was hypocritical and Cecchi was well attuned to that hypocrisy. Yet, as soon as one accepts Cecchi’s critique of the contradictions of American policy one is immediately reminded of Cecchi’s own contradictions. Americans who opposed Italy’s actions in Ethiopia should also have opposed the mistreatment of blacks in the United States, but should Cecchi’s sensitivity to the plight of American blacks not also have led him to oppose Italy’s incursion in Ethiopia? If Americans’ tolerance of anti-Semitism in the United States was immoral, was Cecchi not similarly immoral for citing this tolerance in order to excuse anti-Semitism in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany? Cognizant of America’s moral failings and rhetorical contradictions, Cecchi might have developed a more consistent and coherent approach to questions of racial justice. Instead, he chose to repudiate the American polemic merely in order to reinforce Italian policy, excusing Italy’s racism by emphasizing the racism of Italy’s accusers.

One cannot and should not deny that Cecchi, Villari, Ebner, Bruni, and other prominent intellectuals of the Fascist era were both sensitive to the oppression of African Americans and outspoken in their opposition to American injustices. One should not forget, however, that they were also apologists for Italian injustices. They refused to apply the same moral principles to their own society as they did to that of the United States, and this duplicity must certainly undercut their otherwise forceful critiques of American racism. As Edward Said declared in his

---

1993 Reith Lectures, “representing the collective suffering of your own people, testifying to its travails, reasserting its enduring presence, [and] reinforcing its memory,” are never sufficient goals for intellectual engagement. Rather,

[f]or the intellectual the task […] is explicitly to universalize the crisis, to give greater human scope to what a particular race or nation suffered, to associate that experience with the sufferings of others. It is inadequate only to affirm that a people was dispossessed, oppressed or slaughtered, denied its rights and its political existence, without at the same time […] affiliating those horrors with the similar afflictions of other people.\(^\text{70}\)

In other words, intellectuals should be expected to condemn the same offenses at home as they do abroad, holding their own nation to the same standards to which they hold all others. It is “[o]ne of the shabbiest of all intellectual gambits […] to pontificate about abuses in someone else’s society and to excuse exactly the same practices in one’s own,” Said argued, and the work of many of the leading intellectuals under Fascism is largely characterized by this ploy.\(^\text{71}\) When Cecchi and Villari used American racism to justify Italian anti-Semitism, or when Ebner recalled the horrors of American chattel slavery to vindicate what he saw as the lesser injustices of Italian colonialism, they undermined the very principles they claimed to uphold. They were eager to denounce the inequities of others but no less eager to excuse the inequities of their own society. Sensitive to the plight of minorities in the United States, they could not or would not recognize the plight of minorities living under Italian rule.

*Impegno nero* was an attempt to counteract such incongruities, to judge oneself as one would judge one’s adversaries, to diagnose one’s own failures in diagnosing the failures of others. Ultimately, then, what separated postwar *impegno nero* and its characteristic engagement with the African-American struggle from the condemnations of American racism that had circulated under Fascism was imaginative sympathy. Accutely sensitive to analogies between the black and the Italian experiences, intellectuals after the war could no longer condemn the United States without recognizing the Italian implications of each and every condemnation. Thus, whereas Fascism had encouraged critiques of American race relations without recognizing that such critiques might also apply to Italy—indeed, had encouraged criticism of the United States in order to preclude, to challenge, and to counter any criticism of Italy—postwar intellectuals found in African-American literature and its denunciation of American racism a spur for a more critical approach to their own culture and society. After all, as Leone Piccioni argued in the introduction to his 1949 collection of *Letteratura dei negri d’America*, Europeans, too, were implicated in the acts of racism described in much African-American literature:

How can we cast the first stone (and there is good reason to hurl stones, and heavy ones at that), we who, in our illustrious European civilization, have witnessed ruthless racial campaigns and ceaseless persecution? These are yet


\(^{71}\) Ibid., 92.
more instances of the blind madness that often grips men, dragging them far from
the just and moral path, towards unpredictable depths.

Potremmo noi gettare la prima pietra. ed una pietra certo è da scagliare, e pesante)
noi che abbiamo visto nella nostra civilissima Europa spietate campagne razziali,
e persecuzioni senza fine? Sono altri esempi della cieca follia che spesso occupa
gli uomini trascinandoli lontani dalle vie del diritto e della morale, verso baratri
imprevedibili.\footnote{Leone Piccioni, \emph{Letteratura dei negri d’America}, 22.}

Framing his discussion in these terms, Piccioni was demanding from the start that his Italian
readers recall to mind their own complicity in racial violence even as they were led to
sympathize with African-American victims of oppression and to condemn their white oppressors.
In other words, Piccioni aimed to challenge Italy’s own racial attitudes by informing Italians of
American racism. He underlined this desire, moreover, by lamenting its opposite, expressing his
dismay that racists in the United States had continued to mistreat African Americans even after
the Second World War, when the consequences of Europe’s own racist policies should have
made clear to them the perils of their actions. Lamenting that, for the proponents of America’s
racist status quo, “the wretched European lesson seems to have meant nothing [la sciagurata
lezione europea pare non abbia senso],” Piccioni was warning his Italian readers not to fall into
the same trap.\footnote{Ibid., 30.} Americans had failed to learn from Europe’s “wretched lesson,” but Italians
should nonetheless learn from America, Piccioni implied. Drawing on their outrage against the
racial injustice movingly depicted in African-American literature, Italians should stamp out the
lingering traces of racism in their own country. Ultimately, therefore, Piccioni was instructing his
Italian readers to find in the work of black writers in the United States not only a condemnation
of American society, but also—and perhaps more significantly—a provocation for reform in
Italy. That two-fold approach, that searching examination, at once inwardly and outwardly
focused, is the truest sign of \emph{impegno nero}.

Like the \emph{mito dell’America} on which it was modeled, \emph{impegno nero} was characterized by
its self-critical hermeneutic, grounded in the belief that every critique of a foreign culture
contained, \emph{in nuce}, the seeds of a critique of Italian culture. Through their empathetic and self-
reflexive reading of African-American literature, Italian intellectuals developed a transnational
rhetoric of \emph{impegno}, espousing the cause of racial equality in the United States and drawing on
the African-American struggle in order to redouble their own efforts in the struggle for justice in
Italy. Not only did they demonstrate a commitment to domestic and international political
causes, in other words; they repeatedly declared those causes to be united by a shared ethic and a
common ambition. By calling attention to the similarities between the Italian situation and that
which prevailed in the United States, Calvino, Rèpaci, Del Bo, Caproni, Pavese, Vittorini, Piccioni,
and others were commenting on—indeed intervening in—the struggle to rebuild Italy
after Fascism. In stark contrast to the hypocritical condemnations of American racism developed
under Fascism, therefore, the critiques put forward after the Second World War tended to look
inward as well as outward, to link Italian and American social reform. Italian intellectuals
protested both against the exploitation of blacks in the United States and against the exploitation
of the poor in Italy, working to convey their internationalist vision for a more just society to
come. Their *impegno*—their effort to remake Italian culture and to guide Italian social reform—was thus an *impegno nero*: it was founded upon, and subtended by, a real investment in the social and cultural ambitions of African Americans. Arguing that racism in the United States resembled economic exploitation in Europe, that violent attacks on African Americans mirrored those on European minorities during the war, that the miseries of black poverty paralleled the miseries of wartime poverty in Italy, and that the militant opposition to injustice central to African-American literature could provide the impetus for a new, engaged Italian culture, Italy’s postwar intellectuals renewed their *impegno*, uniting it with their profound commitment to the African-American struggle.
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