



ISSN: 1353-2944 (Print) 1469-9877 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cmit20>

The moral conundrums of the historian: Claudio Pavone's *A Civil War* and its legacy

Guri Schwarz

To cite this article: Guri Schwarz (2015) The moral conundrums of the historian: Claudio Pavone's *A Civil War* and its legacy, *Modern Italy*, 20:4, 427-437, DOI: [10.1080/13532944.2015.1103487](https://doi.org/10.1080/13532944.2015.1103487)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13532944.2015.1103487>



Published online: 18 Nov 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 25



View related articles [↗](#)




View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cmit20>

CONTEXTS AND DEBATES

The moral conundrums of the historian: Claudio Pavone's *A Civil War* and its legacy

Guri Schwarz* 

Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

The recent English translation of Claudio Pavone's book on the Italian civil war (1943–1945) represents an occasion to reconsider Resistance historiography and memory politics. This paper discusses Pavone's book and looks back on its genesis, while at the same time reflecting on its legacy. The aim is to offer some insight on the evolution of historiographic narratives concerning the Resistance and the civil war in the last decades.

Keywords: civil war; Claudio Pavone; Italian Resistance; anti-fascism; memory; historiography

Introduction

Claudio Pavone's masterpiece, *Una guerra civile: Saggio storico sulla moralità nella Resistenza* (Pavone 1991), has been one of the few truly paradigm shifting works in recent Italian historiography. The publication – although belated – of an English translation, entitled *A Civil War: A History of the Italian Resistance*, is good news indeed, finally making this important work available to a wider audience.¹ The translators – the late Peter Levy with the assistance of David Broder, who completed the work – deserve credit; the volume (published by Verso) also benefits from a chronology and a glossary, which help students and non-specialist readers to access the intricacies of Italian political, military and cultural life, and from a brief introduction by Stanislao Pugliese. The appearance of an English edition, 22 years after the original was published in the prestigious 'Nuova Cultura' series of Bollati-Boringhieri (Turin), is an occasion both to re-read Pavone's work and to reconsider its impact on historiography and on the Italian political and cultural debate regarding the legacy of fascism, the Second World War and the Resistance in the last 20 years.

Origins and early reception of the book

Few history books have had such a strong impact on both scholars and the wider public, changing as it did the way the experience of the Resistance – the founding myth of the Italian Republic – was represented. The book sold over 6000 copies in less than two months, unexpectedly for such a complex and weighty volume, and – contrary to the usual fate of scholarly books in the Italian publishing industry – its success was long lasting. A paperback edition was published in 1994, followed by three subsequent reprints in 2006, 2009 and 2013. Its commercial success was in large part due to

*Email: guri.schwarz@gmail.com

external factors: the end of the Cold War era stimulated a reappraisal of the Second World War, that defining period in European history. Battles over history and memory, which had begun in the previous decade, became even more intense throughout the Continent, combining political confrontation and scholarly analysis (Müller 2002, 1–37).

Without denying the momentous effect that the fall of the Berlin Wall had on the contemporary political and cultural landscape, it is important to emphasise that a struggle over the past, which was of course a way of rethinking the present and shaping the future, had been going on for at least 10 years. Since the end of the 1970s, or the early 1980s, we can clearly see a crisis emerging in the consensus concerning memory on which Western Europe had been founded. A debate ensued, which took different forms in different countries, but everywhere had a common focus on memory: what to remember, how to remember it and why. Together with the emphasis on memory grew an awareness of the issues of guilt and responsibility, which took centre stage primarily, but not exclusively, in connection with the Holocaust. So in France, we saw the high-profile trials of Maurice Papon and Paul Touvier, and then that of the former head of the Lyon Gestapo office, Klaus Barbie (Battini 2003; Goslan 2000; Rousso 1987; Wieviorka 1998; Wolf 2004). The past was also a battlefield in the Federal Republic of Germany, for example in the joint visit of Helmut Kohl and Ronald Reagan to the Bitburg military cemetery (Fulbrook 1999, 95–99; Marcuse 2001, 350–64) and later the *Historikerstreit* (for an overall assessment see Evans 1989; Maier 1988; for a psychoanalytical outlook see LaCapra 1994, 43–67; LaCapra 1998, 43–72). The legacy of the Second World War was also being reconsidered in Italy, where the meaning and value of the ‘anti-fascist paradigm’ on which the Republic had been founded was losing its relevance as the fulcrum of moral legitimisation of the political system (Baldassarre 1986). In that decade, stimulated by the passionate debates started in the mid-1970s by Renzo De Felice,² we saw the growth of media attention to historical debates, combined with the tendency to reconsider the fascist experience in a more positive light, while downplaying the value and the morality of anti-fascist ideologies (for different approaches to that debate see Galli della Loggia 1986; Tranfaglia 1983; also Nani 2007).

All these processes were accelerated by the end of the Cold War, in Italy arguably in an ‘extremely chaotic manner’, as Pavone himself noted in a concise essay on the evolving role of the Resistance in the political and cultural struggles of post-war Italy, published a year after the appearance of his magnum opus (Pavone 1992, 461). The dramatic collapse of the Italian political system, with the rapid disappearance of the political parties that had animated the Resistance struggle and then shaped the post-war political system – something truly unique in Western Europe – combined with other, more permanent, factors in determining the crisis of the anti-fascist narrative, playing a key role in the development of the modes of self-representation of the Italian nation. In the early 1990s, these tectonic shocks produced passionate discussions – based mostly in a middle ground between political struggle and scholarly confrontation – reflecting and at the same time intensifying the need to come to terms with the origins of the Italian Republic and with the powerful narratives that had shaped individual and collective identities in the post-war period. To a certain extent, these struggles were an extension of the political turmoil that was tearing the country apart, and they certainly were a factor in the development of the political-cultural shift that took place later with the advent of the Berlusconi era (Legnani 1994). The crisis and then the collapse of the political

organism inevitably stimulated a critical outlook on the past, and in particular towards those founding moments – or founding myths – which had given shape and some kind of stability to the system for over 40 years.

However, although the debate of the early 1990s was a continuation, albeit in a highly radicalised form, of the ideological confrontations that had begun in the previous decade, it was different in both tone and content. In the 1980s the main motive was to rehabilitate the fascist era, celebrating the modernising qualities of Mussolini's regime, and to give legitimacy to the neo-fascists of the Movimento Sociale Italiano, for example in the well-known interview given by Renzo De Felice to Giuliano Ferrara in *Corriere della Sera*.³ In the early 1990s the scenario had changed somewhat: the 'tyranny of the present' over the past, or the daily manipulations of distant dramas for contingent political purposes, now directly challenged the Resistance and its legacy (Gallerano 1995, 32). The attack on anti-fascist rhetoric and the Resistance myth was undoubtedly also an attack on the Communist Party, whose role in the political and cultural system was being increasingly disputed. This is particularly clear if we look back at the polemics of the year 1990, when issues connected to the violence perpetrated during and especially in the immediate aftermath of the war were brought to the attention of the public by an intense media campaign (Cooke 2011, 151–154; Focardi 2005, 56–59). The confrontations over the bloody feuds that were consummated in the so-called 'triangle of death' – an area inside Emilia where several politically motivated murders took place after the war was over – contributed to challenge the morality of the Resistance, and in particular to cast a shadow over the communists, for whom participation in the Resistance had been (and substantially still was) a key symbolic factor in their recognition as a legitimate political force. In different forms, and with a minor emphasis on the memory of the anti-Semitic persecutions – which were, in any case, gaining growing attention from both the media and academic scholarship since the late 1980s – in Italy as elsewhere the analysis of the past was animated by an impulse to reconsider the conventional narratives, reviewing previous perspectives on violence and victimhood, raising moral dilemmas (the meaning and value of the anti-fascist struggle) and shifting the traditional balance in the attribution of guilt.

It was in this heated and highly confrontational climate that Pavone's book emerged on the scene in 1991. It was the fruit of many long years of research, reflecting the continuing debates of the 1980s⁴ briefly mentioned already, and, unavoidably, its reception was affected by the echoes of the 'triangle of death' confrontations of the previous year. The title of the book, *Una guerra civile (A Civil War)*, certainly created media hype (for an overall analysis of the media reaction see Legnani 1992). The title was not Pavone's first choice. In an important interview published in 1991 in the journal of the *Istituto per la storia della resistenza e della società contemporanea in provincia di Alessandria* (Borioli and Botta 1991, 19–42),⁵ Pavone clarified that his original title was what then became the subtitle (*Saggio storico sulla moralità nella Resistenza*).⁶ The publisher had suggested that such a title could be misleading, since it invited confusion between the meaning 'morality in the Resistance and 'the morality of the Resistance', and therefore risked being perceived as unequivocally celebratory and hagiographic. The next step had been to consider *The Three Wars* as a possible title, since the book's thesis is that the Resistance contained three diverse conflicts – national liberation struggle, class war and civil war – but this was also discarded because it seemed too abstruse and possibly confusing.⁷ So emerged the idea of highlighting the most original and controversial aspect, the idea of *civil war*: Alfredo Salsano, editor-in-chief at Bollati Boringhieri and Vittorio Foa, a close friend of Pavone, both preferred

this because of its provocative tone. It must be remembered that, even though during the Resistance and in the immediate aftermath of the war some anti-fascist circles – and most notably the *Azionisti* – often used this formula to describe the clash between fascists and anti-fascists, in the post-war climate it had rapidly become the prerogative of the neo-fascists, who aimed at giving legitimacy to their side by presenting the two opposing factions as if they were somehow on the same level (Germinario 1999). So the use of that title by an anti-fascist scholar such as Pavone was perceived by many as both a provocation and a concession to the rhetoric of those nostalgic for the Salò regime. That was not, of course, the intention of Pavone, who – in the aforementioned interview as well as in the preface to his book – explained that ‘with the category of civil war the moral problems which have been the fabric of the book emerge better’ (Borioli-Botta 1991; Pavone 2013, 3; see also Bobbio and Pavone 2015, 160). In any case, that title – and the insistence on the value of such an analytical category, probably one of the most important aspects of Pavone’s contribution, resonated uneasily in the ears of the ‘old guard’ of former partisans who had become intellectuals, journalists and scholars. Nuto Revelli, who greatly appreciated the book, declared that in his eyes the conflict waged in Italy between 1943 and 1945 could not be considered a civil war ‘because the fascists were foreigners as much, and maybe more so, than the Germans’ – a critique that in fact confirms Pavone’s argument, as he aptly noted in the interview given to Borioli and Botta, since denying the opponents’ identity as fellow countrymen is indeed one of the characteristics of a civil war.⁸ Another well-known commentator, Giorgio Bocca, insisted on the patriotic – *‘risorgimentale’* – quality of the struggle, and considered the ‘civil war’ definition as ‘exaggerated’ and ‘false’.⁹ Scholars such as Giuliano Procacci and Mario Mirri protested in turn that the key issue was the German occupation (and thus that the conflict with the Italian fascists was marginal) (Procacci 1998, 587), or that the focal point of attention should be the collective, passionate participation of wide strata of the population in the foundation of a democratic Republic, presenting the fascists as a marginal element and a mere residue of the past, in contrast to the ideals and sacrifices of the partisans (Mirri 1993).

From the ‘other side’, from those still connected to the legacy of Salò, the legitimacy awarded to such a formula, and thus the apparent recognition of the fascists as (co)-protagonists of that founding moment of national history, was seen as due homage, heralding some form of overdue national reconciliation. So, for example, the neo-fascist intellectual Gian Accame claimed that thanks to Pavone the fascists of the Italian Social Republic and their neo-fascist heirs were ‘finally treated as human beings’.¹⁰

These are, of course, superficial and manipulative arguments. Pavone’s intention was not to redeem the unredeemable, the lingering supporters of Mussolini; instead, he initiated a new critical outlook on one of the most complex, delicate and symbolically charged moments of modern Italian history.

Pavone’s innovations: between historiography and political engagement

In such a confrontational climate, Pavone’s work was bound to be misinterpreted and manipulated, but it is important to look beyond this and consider what kind of a response it offered to the crisis of the anti-fascist paradigm. The aim was to encourage a shift of scenery, moving beyond the simple opposition of those who celebrated the Resistance and those who downplayed the values of the anti-fascist struggle and highlighted the faults and the contradictions of the resisters. We could say that Pavone was performing the kind of political move celebrated by Vittorio Foa in his autobiography:

the non-linear move of the knight on the chessboard, in opposition to the more obvious and confrontational move of the rook (Foa 1991). This is clear because of his choice to write about the morality *in* (as opposed to *of*) the Resistance. The battleground – the field of morality – was only to a limited degree his choice since, as I indicated earlier, it had been the key issue in all the debates about the past that had marked the European political and cultural landscape for over a decade, and – to a certain extent – still do today. But what is Pavone's approach to the issue of morality?

A Civil War is very well written and engaging: it is also an extremely thoughtful, complex and layered work, by a historian with traditional skills, a scholar of politics and institutions, who is grappling with the challenge of studying emotions, ideas and – even though he rejected the term – mentalities. To the study of '*mentalità*' he opposes the study of '*moralità*':

The word that seemed to me to best summarise what appeared to become the object of my research was '*moralità*'. Not 'morals', a term that, on the one hand, was confined to the individual conscience, while on the other risked sliding into the rhetoric of the Resistance. Not '*mentalità*', a word that in a short time has acquired multiple meanings and generated controversies which I did not intend to get caught up in. (Pavone 2013, 1–2)

This is not merely a nominalistic issue. It is a clear-cut methodological choice of an author selecting his own battleground, avoiding the intricacies of the long and complex discussion over what the *histoire des mentalités* was and what it was supposed to be. In making this choice, he puts a distance between his work and a codified historiographical approach, thus acquiring more liberty and autonomy.

In the very first pages of the preface, Pavone introduces the reader to his very individual perspective. His goal, he claims, is not to illustrate the wide variety of cultural imaginaries surrounding the experience of the Italian populace in the period 1943–1945, but to probe a more specific area. I quote his own words:

Moralità is a word particularly suited to define the territory on which politics and ethics meet and clash, relying on history as a possible common measure. It was necessary, whenever possible, to immerse oneself in the historical context when dealing with matters that first appeared to be political but which were in reality great moral problems and, reciprocally, to show how these same historical events necessarily influenced those problems. (Pavone 2013, 2)

So we have not simply an investigation of emotions and ideals, but a more specific focus on the intersection between politics and ethics. It is hard not to see in this an echo of the profound ethical and political crisis of Italian society and its party system of those years. *A Civil War* is in fact a work of militant historiography, responding with lucidity and erudition to the challenges of the present. As Pavone himself would write one year later:

Talking about civil war is intended as an invitation to ... re-establish a democratic national identity on a firmer basis. A country such as Italy, whose history is lacking in clear and incontrovertible definitions, has everything to gain by reclaiming, as a cornerstone of a renewed identity, the moment of truth represented by the civil war between fascist and anti-fascist. (Pavone 1992, 478)

The divisive nature of the conflict that took place between 1943 and 1945 is not denied, minimised or hidden with embarrassment; instead it is taken seriously, with all its implications. Pavone is not merely refuting the attacks on the Resistance and the discourse on its limits and fallacies; he is operating a shift in perspective. As he would do some years later with Nolte's thesis concerning the European civil war, he does not

shy away from giving careful and serious consideration to the challenges to the anti-fascist narrative, and at the same time he is able to critically reformulate such arguments (Pavone 1994). To put it concisely, he moves beyond the mere contraposition of different ideological views, beyond the thesis and anti-thesis clash that characterised much of the debate both in Italy and elsewhere in Europe (Pavone 1992).

Proceeding on that peculiar and arduous terrain – the area between politics and ethics, viewed through the prism of history – implied a series of methodological choices. Some are more obvious, and explicitly mentioned in the preface: a shift from ‘top’ to ‘bottom’, moving from the conventional institutional and political scholarship on the Resistance to a reconstruction of the daily challenges and dilemmas faced by individuals and groups in the field; a respect for the nuances and contradictions that lay in the heart of each man and woman, what Pavone calls ‘the love of ambiguity that alone allows us to comprehend others when they resonate in us’; finally, the autobiographical nature of such an analytical path for a person who had lived through those same struggles he now proposed to reconstruct critically (Pavone 2013, 3).¹¹

Other choices are not presented in such a direct fashion, but emerge from a critical reading of the text and from other indications the author gave us in interviews and subsequent writings. One key issue concerns the way he interrogates his sources and the way he combines them. The book is built on a complex interweaving of diverse documents: traditional archival sources, depicting the views of political parties and organisations such as the Comitato di Liberazione Nazionale (CLN), juxtaposed with memoirs and autobiographies (written both during the conflict and after the end of the war), and also with novels and works of fiction. The different levels and diverse sources make sense together inasmuch as they revolve around a common problem, be it the issue of the oath of allegiance, to which he dedicates one of the best chapters of the book, or that of violence and how it was typically perceived by fascists and anti-fascists, possibly the least convincing chapter.¹²

The end result is an inextricable entanglement of voices, of testimonies expressed in very diverse fashion and yet all resounding with the same urgency, all revolving around a common moral dilemma. This approach, combining points of view from very different figures, expressed in varying contexts and at different times, sometimes blurs important local and chronological distinctions. So it is not surprising to see that one of the most commonly recurring words in this long text is ‘*groviglio*’, which is translated in the English edition as either ‘tangle’ or ‘knot’. The repeated use of this term can be read as an indication of the author’s difficulty in reconstructing scenarios of such complexity. Unlike most historians, often tempted by the easy way out, Pavone does not cut the knot, but tries to follow the individual threads and to give a sense of their intertwining as they combine to create a tightly knit bundle of emotions, forces and aspirations.

The way these different planes interact, and the way he fuses together the shifting perspectives that derive from political documents, first-hand diaries and fictional literary representations, raises serious methodological issues. In particular, the relationship between fictional accounts and historical documents appears both problematic and fascinating. Pavone uses mainly Fenoglio and Calvino, considering only to a minor degree Pavese and Mengaldo, while ignoring or paying very scarce attention to other writers such as, for example, Viganò, Cassola or Vittorini. These texts (this is especially true of Fenoglio) are manipulated without particular attention to philological issues or to their complex genetic history (Bigazzi 1993). Pavone justified his selection of the writers as his personal taste (Borioli and Botta 1991), yet it can reasonably be argued that

those are the writers who probed more intensely the psychological and moral dramas of the Italian civil war. The first self-evident issue one might raise here is of chronological coherence: these are texts written after the war, sometimes many years later, and yet they are used as documents that capture the emotions and ideals not of their time but of a previous moment (this is also partly true of many of the memoirs used). The problem does not lie merely in the use of such sources to illuminate a previous period, but in the juxtaposition of post-war and fictional accounts with coeval historical documents, apparently putting them on the same analytical level, as if they all carried a similar content of truth.

The works of literature are certainly efficient in producing closer contact with the supposed sentiments of the men and women involved in the conflict: they are fictional and at the same time hyper-realistic. Yet, as works of fiction, they do not and cannot offer valid documentary proof of actual events and social, political or cultural dynamics. Quite clearly such an approach poses several problems in terms of its non-linear relationship to the conventional scholarly approach, and it raises fundamental issues concerning the relationship between fact and fiction in history writing. This in fact reveals a lot about the approach chosen by Pavone and about his goals. The literary texts and the other sources are put on the same plane because they are all used as *exempla*: the goal is to paint a vivid picture of the many moral challenges faced at the time and of the various responses. *A Civil War* is not, in this sense, a scholarly work of history in the conventional sense, and Pavone declares this openly in the aforementioned interview with Borioli and Botta: ‘This’, he says, ‘is an essay and not a history book written according to scientific criteria.’ He argues that it is the prism created by the analysis of the morality in the Resistance that seems to cause and at the same time justify such a potentially controversial operation:

If we work on morality, or on the most profound ethical convictions then the search for proof becomes more difficult, and the documentary support ends up having more the characteristic of the example than that of the proof. This means that I decided, certainly in an arbitrary way, that among the many examples that have piled up and that could be exposed, some would speak to the reader better than others, that they would speak somehow on their own, thus indicating directly the problem that interested me the most. (Borioli and Botta 1991)

In fact that is why Pavone defends the choice of the original subtitle, with the emphasis on the formula ‘*saggio storico*’; this is not a history of the Italian Resistance. In this sense the subtitle of the English edition (*A History of the Italian Resistance*) is misleading, even though the choice is understandable by a publisher wishing to make the nature of the book immediately recognisable to its potential readership. We might also add that not only it is not, nor does it wish to be, a history of the Resistance, but – to some degree – it has also proved that writing such a history, in the conventional sense (in the way Roberto Battaglia did it in the early 1950s¹³), would somehow be of little interest or relevance today. What Pavone effectively demonstrates is that, today, thinking about the Resistance in historical terms means, most of all, to consider the resisters. He paves the way for renewed attention to the individuality and the subjectivity of the men and women involved in those struggles, and this – among others – is one of the most relevant legacies of his work.

We can argue that, since the publication of this fundamental work, some of the best and most innovative research concerning that troubled phase of Italian history took shape, following the same approach. This is evident, for example, in the new studies of the formation and characteristics of anti-partisan memory, which bear an evident

connection to a renewed attention to subjectivity and the morality of the armed struggle under Nazi occupation; those studies developed the research on the civil war further, including the use of oral history, which was not part of Pavone's toolbox (Contini 1997; Gribaudo 2005; Pezzino 1997; Portelli 1999). Moreover, if we look at how historiography developed in the 20-plus years since the publication of *A Civil War*, it is clear how much it influenced all subsequent studies: the new research on German occupation (Klinkhammer 1993), on the fascists of Salò (Gagliani 1999; Ganapini 1999), on the 'war against civilians' (Battini and Pezzino 1997) are all, in different ways, indebted to Pavone's groundbreaking work, which certainly stimulated renewed interest and a potential for further investigation. Finally, if we were to look at the potential still inherent in Pavone's research today we might suggest that the most interesting paths of analysis probably lie in a micro-historical and biographic approach through which we could further advance in our understanding of the world of the resisters and of their opponents, and this could usefully be done taking one step further and transcending the symbolic barrier of 1945. Something of the sort was attempted by Sergio Luzzato with his *Partigia*, a controversial but stimulating book that takes seriously the innovations brought by Pavone and forces us to look again with interest on the years of the civil war and on its immediate after-effects. (Luzzato 2013).¹⁴

Acknowledgements

This article is a revised version of the paper presented at the conference *After Pavone: new approaches to the study of the Italian Resistance*, organized by Philip Cooke and John Foot, sponsored by ASMI and AHRC and that took place at the Italian Cultural Institute in London on May 10 2014. I wish to thank the organizers for creating such a positive occasion for a fruitful discussion.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. A French translation (*Une guerre civile: Essai historique sur l'éthique de la Résistance italienne*) appeared in Seuil's series 'L'Univers Historique' in 2005.
2. Even more than the monumental biography of Mussolini, the turning point was his *Intervista sul fascismo*, edited by M. Ledeen, Laterza, Bari, 1975.
3. *Corriere della Sera*, 27 December 1987 and 8 January 1988.
4. While certainly connected to his previous research on the Resistance, dating back to the early post-war years, the inception of the work can be traced back to the late 1970s and early 1980s. The first presentation of the nucleus of the future work was made in Turin, in a presentation for the seminar on 'Etica e politica' held at the Centro Piero Gobetti on 24 April 1980. See Pavone's letter to Bobbio of 12 May 1987, in Bobbio and Pavone (2015, 157). Later steps in the development of his work were presented during conferences held in 1985 and 1988 (entitled *La guerra civile* and *Le tre guerre: patriottica, civile e di classe*, now reprinted in Bobbio and Pavone, 24–65 and 66–79, respectively).
5. *Sulla moralità nella resistenza. Conversazione con Claudio Pavone condotta da D. Borioli e R. Botta*, in "Quaderno di Storia Contemporanea", no. 10, 1991. The interview is entirely available online: http://www.isral.it/web/web/risorsedocumenti/intervisteonline_Pavone.htm. All future references will be to this online edition.
6. He had indicated that choice for the title of the book already in a letter sent to Norberto Bobbio on 12 May 1987, in which he described the outline of the work; see Bobbio and Pavone (2015, 157).

7. A thesis that, although in a slightly different form, had been expressed earlier by Norberto Bobbio in a speech of 1965 and in an article of 1990. For the role played by the dialogue between the two scholars in the development of Pavone's work see Bobbio and Pavone 2015 (the aforementioned contributions by Bobbio are reprinted here, 5–15 and 80–83, respectively).
8. Interview with A. Gnoli, 'Fucilavamo i fascisti e non me ne pento', *La Repubblica*, 16 October 1991.
9. G. Bocca, 'No Pavone, è stato un Risorgimento', *L'Espresso*, 20 October 1991.
10. G. Frangi and M. Manisco, interviewing G. Accame and C. Pavone, 'Achille compagno di storia di Ettore' in *Il Sabato* 16 November 1991.
11. Pavone states clearly in the preface of his work that his personal experience, although undeniably present to him, was placed to one side during his analysis. He would later present autobiographical accounts of his anti-fascist militancy (Pavone 2000, 406–410; Pavone 2015).
12. The distinction made between the fascist and anti-fascist ideas concerning the use of violence appears to be the most outdated aspect of the book. Pavone's statements develop, in this case, through a very selective use of his sources: he chooses to consider this from the point of view of a handful of intellectuals and not to give much weight to the literary sources (Fenoglio *in primis*) that give ample indications of the partisan's fascination with violence. It is an approach that clearly echoes Pavone's reaction – along with most anti-fascist intellectuals – when faced with new forms of political violence that erupted with the terrorist movements of the 1970s. This had produced a defensive reflex within the intelligentsia, leading to a growing uneasiness towards political violence that influenced history writing. Pavone's stance on the matter appears clearly formulated since 1982; see his take on the trial of the Brigade Rosse for the murder of Aldo Moro, 'Sparo dunque sono. Il nodo della violenza', *Il Manifesto*, 6 May 1982 (see also D. Bidussa, *Introduzione*, in Bobbio and Pavone 2015, xiv–xix). It is that same climate which has led scholars to shy away from the study of terrorist formations like the Gruppi di Azione Partigiana (GAP): see the introductory remarks made by Santo Peli in his excellent book *Storie di Gap. Terrorismo urbano e Resistenza* (Einaudi, Turin, 2015).
13. R. Battaglia, *Storia della Resistenza Italiana*, Einaudi, Turin, 1953.
14. For a critical evaluation of Luzzato's work see the reviews by Luca Baldissara, Robert S. C. Gordon and Marcello Flores, published in *Storicamente*, 9 (2013); <http://storicamente.org/rubrica-dibattiti-2013.all>. Accessed 15 July 2015.

Notes on contributor

Guri Schwarz received a PhD *summa cum laude* in Historical Disciplines at the Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa in 2002 and currently teaches Modern History at the University of Pisa. He has been awarded research fellowships from the Luigi Einaudi Foundation (Turin), the Department of History of the University of Pisa, the Department of History of the University of Bologna, the International Institute for Holocaust Research-Yad Vashem (Jerusalem), the Deutsches Historisches Institute (Rome), and has been Viterbi Visiting Assistant Professor at the Department of History of UCLA. He is member of the Interdepartmental Center for Jewish Studies of the University of Pisa, and member of the scientific board of the Fondazione Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea (Milan). He is one of the founding editors of the online journal *Quest. Issues in Contemporary Jewish History*. He has authored four books; among them *After Mussolini: Jewish Life and Jewish Memories in Post-Fascist Italy*, London and Portland, OR: Vallentine Mitchell, 2012; *Tu mi devi seppellir. Riti funebri e culto nazionale alle origini della Repubblica*, Turin: UTET, 2010.

ORCID

Guri Schwarz  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8892-8521>

References

- Baldassarre, Antonio. 1986. "La costruzione del paradigma antifascista e la Costituente repubblicana." *Problemi del socialismo* 7: 11–33.
- Battini, Michele, and Paolo Pezzino. 1997. *Guerra ai civili: occupazione tedesca e politica del massacro: Toscana 1944*. Venice: Marsilio.
- Battini, Michele. 2003. *Peccati di memoria. La mancata Norimberga italiana*. Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- Bigazzi, Roberto. 1993. "Storia e letteratura. Appunto in margine a *Una guerra civile*." *Italia Contemporanea* 192: 465–471.
- Bobbio, Norberto, and Pavone Claudio. 2015. *Sulla guerra civile. La Resistenza a due voci*, edited by D. Bidussa. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri.
- Borioli, Daniele, and Botta, Roberto. 1991. "Sulla moralità nella resistenza. Conversazione con Claudio Pavone condotta da D. Borioli e R. Botta." In *Quaderno di Storia Contemporanea*, n. 10. The interview is entirely available online: http://www.isral.it/web/web/risorsedocuments/intervisteonline_Pavone.htm
- Contini, Giovanni. 1997. *La memoria divisa*. Milan: Rizzoli.
- Cooke, Philip. 2011. *The Legacy of the Italian Resistance*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Evans, Richard. 1989. In *Hitler's Shadow: West German Historians and the Attempt to Escape from the Nazi Past*. London: Tauris.
- Foa, Vittorio. 1991. *Il cavallo e la torre: riflessioni su una vita*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Focardi, Filippo. 2005. *La guerra della memoria. La Resistenza nel dibattito politico italiano dal 1945 ad oggi*. Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- Fulbrook, Mary. 1999. *German National Memory after the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gagliani, Daniella. 1999. *Brigate nere: Mussolini e la militarizzazione del Partito fascista repubblicano*. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri.
- Gallerano, Nicola, ed. 1995. *L'uso pubblico della storia*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Galli della Loggia, Ernesto. 1986. "Una storiografia indifferente." *Il Mulino* 306: 586–601.
- Ganapini, Luigi. 1999. *La Repubblica delle camice nere*. Milan: Garzanti.
- Germinario, Francesco. 1999. *L'altra memoria. L'Estrema destra, Salò, la Resistenza*. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri.
- Goslan, Richard J., ed. 2000. *The Papon Affair: Memory and Justice on Trial*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Gribaudo, Gabriella. 2005. *Guerra totale: tra bombe alleate e violenze naziste: Napoli e il fronte meridionale, 1940–44*. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri.
- Klinkhammer, Lutz. 1993. *L'occupazione tedesca in Italia: 1943–1945*. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri.
- LaCapra, Dominick. 1994. *Representing the Holocaust. History, Theory, Trauma*, edited by D LaCapra. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- LaCapra, Dominick. 1998. *History and Memory after Auschwitz*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Legnani, Massimo. 1992. "A proposito di storia, stampa e pubblico. Le accoglienze della 'guerra civile' di Claudio Pavone." *Italia Contemporanea* 186: 119–124.
- Legnani, Massimo. 1994. "Fine del revisionismo storiografico e destra al potere." *Marx centouno* 17: 68–73.
- Luzzatto, Sergio. 2013. *Partigia. Una storia della Resistenza*. Mondadori: Milan.
- Maier, Charles. 1988. *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust and German National Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marcuse, Harold. 2001. *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of the Concentration Camp, 1933–2001*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mirri, Mario. 1993. "Moralità e resistenza: contenuto ed esito politico di una 'guerra civile'." *Società e storia* 60: 369–425.
- Müller, Jan-Werner. 2002. "Introduction: The Power of Memory, the Memory of Power and the Power Over Memory." In *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, edited by J-W Müller, 1–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nani, Michele. 2007. "'Un pubblico diverso': giornalisti, storici e senso comune. Per una ricerca sugli usi della storia nel campo giornalistico." *Contemporanea* 3: 371–401.
- Pavone, Claudio. 1991. *Una guerra civile. Saggio storico sulla moralità nella Resistenza*. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri.

- Pavone, Claudio. 1992. "La Resistenza oggi: problema storiografico e problema civile." In *Rivista di Storia Contemporanea*, XXI (2-3), 456–530. (Later reprinted in Id., *Alle origini della Repubblica. Scritti su fascismo, antifascismo e continuità dello Stato*. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri, 1995, 185-207)
- Pavone, Claudio. 1994. "La seconda guerra mondiale: una guerra civile europea?" In *Guerre fratricide. Le guerre civili in età contemporanea*, edited by Gabriele Ranzato, 86–128. Turin: Bollati-Boringhieri.
- Pavone, Claudio. 2000. "Memorie: dall'esperienza del fascismo al dopoguerra." *Annali di storia dell'educazione e delle istituzioni scolastiche* 7: 406–410.
- Pavone, Claudio. 2013. *A Civil War: A History of the Italian Resistance*. London and New York: Verso.
- Pavone, Claudio. 2015. *La mia resistenza. Memorie di una giovinezza*. Donzelli: Rome.
- Pezzino, Paolo. 1997. *Anatomia di un massacro. Controversia sopra una strage tedesca*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Portelli, Alessandro. 1999. *L'ordine è già stato eseguito: Roma, le Fosse Ardeatine, la memoria*. Rome: Donzelli.
- Procacci, Giuliano. 1998. *Storia degli italiani*. vol. II. Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- Rousso, Henry. 1987. *Le syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours*. Paris: Seuil.
- Tranfaglia, Nicola. 1983. "Fascismo e mass media. Una prima riflessione." *Passato e Presente* 3: 135–148.
- Wieviorka, Annette. 1998. *L'Ere du témoin*. Paris: Plon.
- Wolf, Joan B. 2004. *Harnessing the Holocaust. The Politics of Memory in France*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.