This is the author's accepted manuscript. For published article, see: "Legacies of Fascism: Architecture, Heritage and Memory in contemporary Italy", Modern Italy, special issue "The Force of History", 22, 4, 445–70, https://doi.org/10.1017/mit.2017.51

Legacies of Fascism: Architecture, Heritage and Memory in contemporary Italy

Hannah Malone

Abstract

This article examines how Italy has dealt with the physical remains of the Fascist regime as a window onto Italian attitudes to the past. The *ventennio* left indelible marks on Italy's cities in the form of urban projects, individual buildings, monuments, plaques and street names. In effect, the survival of physical traces contrasts with the hazy memories of Fascism that exist within the Italian collective consciousness. Conspicuous, yet mostly ignored, Italy's Fascist heritage is hidden in plain sight. However, from the 1990s, buildings associated with the regime have sparked a number of debates regarding the public memory of Fascism. Although these debates present an opportunity to re-examine history, they may also be symptomatic of a crisis in the Italian polity and of attempts to rehabilitate Fascism through historical revisionism.

Keywords: Fascism, Christopher Duggan, legacy, de-fascistization, architecture, Benito Mussolini

Introduction

From 1945 to today, the Fascist period has cast a long, but indeterminate, shadow over Italian culture and politics. Although Fascism is fundamental to the identity of republican Italy as an anti-Fascist state, public memories are hazy, selective and unreliable (Corner 2005, 176; Ventresca 2006, 200; Fogu 2006, 67). While the *ventennio* dominates Italian historiography, it occupies an ambiguous position in Italy's collective consciousness. Fascism is often called upon in political debates, but as a rhetorical trope rather than as a historical reality. There are also gaps in the historical record where memories of Fascist repression and violence have been erased through a process of 'removal' ('*rimozione*', Pavone 2000, 21). Italians also remember Fascism in different ways depending on their local context, personal circumstances and

political sympathies. As such, memories of Mussolini's rule are deeply divided and continue to fracture the nation (Foot 2009). Fascism is an absent presence in Italy, as its memory is alive, but distorted, fragmented and obscured.

There is no shared national narrative of Fascism and little consensus as to what it means for Italy today (Pavone 2000, 37; Fogu 2006, 149–50; Samuels 2015, 115). These divisions have been compounded, from the 1990s, by a tendency to revise history in a way that rehabilitates Mussolini's regime (Tranfaglia 1996, 98–9; Corner 2002; 2005; Battini 2003, 1–8; Mammone 2006; Ventresca 2006, 195; see, for example, De Felice 1995). Revisionism emerged when the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Italian Communist Party and the fall of Italy's first republic broke the anti-Fascist coalition, which had dominated Italian politics since the end of the Second World War (Luzzatto 2004, 8; Mammone 2006, 217; Fogu 2006, 161 –7). The crisis of anti-Fascism facilitated the rise of Right-wing parties, such as Forza Italia and Lega Nord. It played into the hands of those who discredited the Resistance as the moral basis of the republic and re-cast Fascism as a patriotic force (Foot 2009, 155). Using politicised notions of national reconciliation, revisionists equated the actions of Fascists and anti-Fascists (Corner 2002, 327). They presented a reassuring and exculpatory image of Fascism, which emphasised consensus instead of coercion, and drew on the myth of *italiani brava gente* to present the regime as harmless (Corner 2005, 177–9; Fogu 2006, 147). While revisionism helped to normalize Fascism as an integral part of national history, it also contributed to attempts to relativize Fascist crimes. Around the same time as the 'post-Fascist' party Alleanza Nazionale entered Silvio Berlusconi's coalition government in 1994, the historical narrative was being distorted to restore Mussolini's reputation through books, films and TV programmes that presented a trivialised and nostalgic view of the Fascist period (Bosworth and Dogliani 2001, 7; Foot 2009, 122; Gundle 2013, 247–54). The situation was not helped by the fact that, on the Left, an idealised view of the Resistance hampered discussions of its limits or relevance (Foot 2009, 153–5).

In the months prior to his death in 2015, Christopher Duggan was preparing a major collaborative project on the 'Legacies of fascism', which was intended to 'examine the variety of channels through which ideas, images and memories of the regime, both in Italy and its colonies/occupied territories, have been relayed, interpreted, filtered and suppressed'.[1] The project was to address the transmission of memories of Fascism through a number of vehicles, including 'parties and political institutions; literature, art, film, photography and television;

buildings and monuments; the Church; family memories and traditions; local initiatives; museums'. Its methodology was to be multidisciplinary, comparative and transnational. Duggan acknowledged that the project had 'considerable implications for contemporary society', particularly in terms of the ways in which 'which perceptions and memories of fascism continue to influence the culture and practices of liberalism and democracy'. The proposal was timely given the politicization of Fascist history to serve current imperatives (Battini 2003, XII; Fogu 2006). Although it is impossible to know what results the project would have yielded, it offers a glimpse of what could have been.

This article picks up on one potential line of inquiry in Duggan's proposal. The project identified a wide range of channels through which legacies of the regime could be passed to future generations – some of which have received more attention than others. For instance, historians have looked at the impact of Fascism on the state, but they have largely neglected the mark left on Italian cities (Pavone 1995; Carter and Martin 2017, 338–40). Much can be gained by studying the Fascist legacy through architecture, as the regime sought to change the Italian mind-set by means of urban space. There is an extensive literature on the regime's urban inventions, but relatively little has been written on their lasting impact on Italy's physical and mental landscapes.[2] Instead of illustrating structural continuity in the law or bureaucracy, architecture offers concrete evidence of cultural continuity (Dondi 2001, 141). It presents an opportunity to tap into a popular memory of Fascism, and to explore Italian mentalities through the spaces of everyday life (Ventresca 2006, 204).

Traces of the Fascist regime are everywhere in Italy in the form of large urban projects, individual buildings, monuments and street names (Figures 1–2). Their enduring presence shows how it was not possible to shake free from the past or, to use Benedetto Croce's expression, to close the Fascist 'parenthesis' as if nothing had happened (Dondi 2001, 144). While the past is evidenced in Italian cities, its position in Italian culture is less obvious; especially, in that a 'collective amnesia' envelopes some aspects of the Fascist period (Dondi 2001, 150; Petrusewicz 2004; Mammone 2006, 215). In effect, the survival of physical traces contrasts with the absence of public memories. The architecture of Fascism is a 'difficult heritage' – not only because memories of the regime are painful and divisive, but also because Fascism is at odds with the values of today's democracy (Macdonald 2009, 4; Samuels 2015, 111–4). Yet Fascist remains 'are rarely understood in exclusively negative terms', but rather elicit a variety of responses (Samuels 2015, 114).

This article aims to explore how Italy has dealt with the physical remains of the dictatorship, from Mussolini's overthrow in July 1943 until the present day, as an expression of Italian attitudes to the Fascist past. It uses architecture as a barometer for fluctuating approaches to the Fascist legacy, and examines debates about material remains as vehicles for discussions about Fascism. To this end, the article has three parts that deal with (1) what happened to the architecture of the Fascist regime, (2) why it happened and (3) a case study that illustrates recent debates around Fascist architecture. The main contention is that the processes through which buildings were preserved, altered or destroyed after the fall of Fascism is akin to the manner in which public memories were selected, revised or erased. In other words, architectural heritage mirrors the selections, omissions and revisions in the historical narrative. The intention is to look at the mechanisms through which memories of Fascism have passed from one generation to the next. Thus, the question is not whether Italians dealt with Fascism in the 'right way', but to show how they responded in a way that suited Italy.

The limits of de-fascistization

It is well known that the process of 'de-fascistization' in Italy was irregular and incomplete, and that a degree of continuity survived between the Fascist and republican states (Pavone 1995, 70–159). After Mussolini's fall in July 1943, there was little opportunity for renewal before the armistice of 8 September brought Italy's invasion from the North and South. After liberation, the effects of twenty years of authoritarian rule, followed by a global war, a civil war and foreign military occupation, made it hard to implement any meaningful agenda of de-fascistization. There was a sense that the memory of Fascism was too divisive and best forgotten. Plans to prosecute Fascist crimes and to purge public bureaucracy were soon abandoned on the grounds that they would destabilise the state and hinder the transition to democracy (Roy Domenico 1991; Pavone 1995, 139–40, 140–6; Dondi 2001, 143–4; Battini 2003, 20–71; Ventresca 2006, 196). To mark the birth of the Italian republic in June 1946, the communist leader and Minister of Justice, Palmiro Togliatti, granted an amnesty to all but the most prominent Fascists as part of a strategy of pacification (Franzinelli 2016). As a result, the civil service, judiciary and political establishment maintained high levels of socio-political continuity (Roy Domenico 1991, 225–6; Pavone 1995, 70–159). To avoid international pressure, some Italians attempted to shift the blame onto the Germans by arguing that Fascism was not as 'bad' as National Socialism, and that Italy was itself a victim of Nazi-Fascism. They claimed that either Mussolini was solely responsible, or that all Italians were equally culpable;

thus, turning 'collective guilt' into 'collective absolution' (Corner 2002, 325; Petrusewicz 2004, 269; also, Corner 2005, 179–80). Ultimately, de-fascistization was hampered by the ambivalence of the Allies and by an Italian desire to return to normality (Roy Domenico 1991, 19–29). However, papering over the cracks of a divided nation may have contributed to weakening the moral foundations of the republic.

There was no specific policy of 'de-fascistization' to eliminate traces of the dictatorship from Italian cities. The Ministry of Education proposed to create a commission to remove Fascist monuments in July 1944, but nothing came of it (Arthurs 2014, 289; Carter and Martin 2017, 346–7). Without national guidelines, local authorities intervened in a haphazard fashion on a case-by-case basis. Change occurred over time, and sometimes resulted from natural senescence or the need for restoration. There was little public discussion about how to treat the material remains of Fascism. Thus, preservation happened in the same patchy way in which memories were (or were not) transmitted to future generations.

Faced with the question of what to do with buildings and monuments of the regime, the Italians were presented with three main options: to destroy, neglect or re-use. The first option, destruction, was often the result of spontaneous attacks after regime change (Foot 2009, 69; Arthurs 2012, 287–8; Storchi 2013, 202). There were three main waves of destruction: the first in a few hours between Mussolini's overthrow on 25 July 1943 and Badoglio's crackdown; the second after the armistice of 8 September; and the third at end of the war in 1945, which was cut short when the Allies occupied major Fascist sites. Destruction was reserved for the most obvious Fascist symbols, such as fasces and representations of the Duce (Carter and Martin 2017, 345). For example, at the Littoriale (now Renato Dall'Ara) stadium in Bologna, a bronze statue of Mussolini on horseback was 'decapitated' on 26 July 1943 in a kind of ritual murder (Foot 2009, 70; Storchi 2013, 201–6). Through a symbolic process of 'recycling', the statue was melted down in 1947 and re-cast as monuments to murdered partisans. It was a natural consequence of 'Mussolinism', or the cult that identified Fascism with Mussolini's body, that stature of the dictator would be destroyed (Gallerano 1988, 317–9; Luzzatto 2011; Arthurs 2014, 287). Overall, destruction was limited to a few high-profile monuments and much was preserved.

Many buildings were simply neglected; as for example, the Casa delle Armi, or fencing school, which is part of Rome's Foro Mussolini (now Italico) (Figure 3). Neglect might be calculated

or deliberate, and might embody a wilful forgetting of the Fascist past (MacDonald 2006; 2009; Samuels 2015, 118). It can also result from economic necessity and be ideologically neutral. Clearly, after the war, Italy lacked the funds to maintain the regime's costly flagship projects and many buildings were no longer useful.

The most common response was the third option, that is, to re-use or recycle buildings of the regime (Maulsby 2014, 28–9; Hökerberg 2017, 770–1). Re-use might be consistent where buildings were re-employed in a way that was in line with their intended purpose, as in the case of the train stations in Florence, Milan and other Italian cities. It might also be subversive, as when an 'adult' cinema occupies a hostel for invalids of war, as in Casa del Mutilato di Guerra in Naples. Of course, consistency and subversion are not alternatives. For example, the ossuary of Redipuglia in Friuli, which was built in 1935–8 to house fallen soldiers of WWI, is now used as a military monument to house ceremonies to commemorate the dead. Equally, it was employed by Pope Francis in 2014 as a monument to peace, despite its militarist symbolism. There is also a middle ground between consistency and subversion, where a building is re-purposed, but references to its original function are kept, as in Rome's Trastevere district where a social club of the Fascist state was re-used as a cinema (Figure 4). Even when Fascist symbols remain, there may be an implicit de-fascistization in the appropriation of architecture created by the dictatorship (Maulsby 2014, 31; Samuels 2015, 119; Carter and Martin 2017, 347). However, re-use may have more to do with satisfying practical needs, than mastering the past (Samuels 2015, 121).

When buildings were re-used, the process of recycling often brought changes to the structure (Maulsby 2014, 29). Frequently, the fasces, as the Fascist symbols *par excellence*, were chiselled from façades leaving ghostly outlines, which might be compared to the 'gaps' in the historical record (Petrusewicz 2004; Foot 2009, 84). In some cases, entire fasces were removed through a form of 'mutilation' (Macdonald 2009, 52). In others, only the Lictor's axe, as the symbol of power and violence, was removed from the bundle of rods through a process that has been described as 'castration' (Benton 1999, 218). Such acts of iconoclasm attest to a belief in the power of symbols. In this sense, de-fascistization had a quasi-religious character in its aim to purify a site and consecrate it to a new 'religion' (Gentile 2007, 257).

There were also more complex forms of erasure, as can be seen in the Arch of Victory that stands opposite Brignole station in Genoa, and which commemorates fallen soldiers of the First

World War (Malone 2017). The monument is decorated by bas-relief scenes that represent Italian soldiers fighting, praying and dying on the frontlines. In one of the tableaux, the Duce is depicted as a 'superman', or the most muscular among the fighting soldiers. In a symbolic act of capital punishment, his image has been de-faced and inscribed with 'executed by the people 28 April 1945' (Figure 5). Again, this shows how Mussolini's image was seen to represent the regime. As well as erasures, there were also additions, as in the case of a statue in the Roman area of EUR, which was re-named from 'Genius of Fascism' to 'Genius of Sport' with the addition of an ancient Roman boxing glove to disguise the Roman salute (Figure 6; Gentile 2007, 190–1; Kallis 2014, 261; Carter and Martin 2017, 350). Although this alteration might seem purely cosmetic, it is also in the way it undermines the statue's symbolic power.

A cheap and easy way to change the character of Fascist sites was by re-naming monuments, streets and piazzas (Ladd 1997, 208; Kallis 2014, 259; Hökerberg 2017, 766). This process rests on a form of nominative determinism, or a belief that changing a name alters the meaning of a place. New names often belonged to opponents or victims of Fascism, and were chosen for a sense of vindication. For example in Rome, Lictor Bridge (Ponte Littorio) was re-named after the socialist Giacomo Matteotti to mark the place where he was kidnapped by Fascists and brought to his death in 1924 – although the Lictor's fasces are still visible today (Figure 7). Equally, in Florence, the Giovanni Berta stadium, named after a Fascist *squadrista* killed by communists in 1921, became the *stadio comunale* (later Artemio Franchi). After the war, the stadium was chosen as the location for a shrine to commemorate the 'martyrs' of Campo di Marte, five young men who were executed by the militia of the Italian Social Republic in 1944.

Through the mechanisms of destruction, neglect and recycling, the 'Fascist layer' of Italian cities was altered, but it was not erased, and much survives across Italy in terms of art and architecture (Figure 8). The presence of remains might seem at odds with the absence of Fascism in some areas of public discourse, but both the survival of remnants and the disappearance of historical memories were part of a difficult transition from dictatorship to democracy. What is significant is that memories of Fascism have not been completely forgotten, nor have Fascist sites been kept intact. Rather, Fascist symbols were excised and altered in the same patchy and random way in which memories were selected and distorted. In this sense, architecture reflected, and supported, the transmission of memories to future generations through a selective process of remembering. Interventions into the built

environment show that, alongside a tendency towards 'collective amnesia', there were also limited efforts to tackle the past (Ventresca 2006, 189–90).

The survival of Fascist remains in Italy is in marked contrast to the situation in Germany, where much more was demolished by bombing or post-war intervention (Ladd 1997; Rosenfeld 2000; MacDonald 2009 and 2006; Rosenfeld and Jaskot 2008). Whereas the Allies tolerated, and even encouraged, the preservation of Fascist symbols in Italy, they sought to eliminate any trace of National Socialism in Germany (Arthurs 2014, 289; Carter and Martin 2017, 345). Like the Italians, the German authorities struggled to deal with the heritage of the dictatorship. Faced with the same options of whether to destroy, re-use or neglect buildings, they opted more often for destruction, until the late 1980s, when they started to 'neutralise' sites through explanatory information or the creation of visitors' centres. This approach is exemplified in the 'Topography of Terror' exhibition in Berlin, which was erected in 2010 next to the Ministry of Finance (formerly, Aviation) built in 1935–6 (Ladd 1997, 154–67). Similarly, in 1992, a documentation centre was created to provide historical details at Prora, a seaside resort built in 1936–9 by the Nazi leisure organization Kraft durch Freude (Strength through Joy). Thus, in recent decades, Germany has embraced 'critical preservation', that is, preservation supplemented by educational material, which is intended to contextualize, transform and 'desacralize' sites (Hökerberg 2017). Recent policies reflect efforts to integrate the memory of National Socialism into the history of re-united Germany. By comparison, this urge to come to terms with the past has been felt less strongly in Italy, which may be a sign of an incomplete transition to democracy, or simply of less of a need to conquer the past (Samuels 2015, 115). In Italy, the norm is 'uncritical preservation' without contextualization, which allows Fascist sites to blend into the urban landscape (Carter and Martin 2016, 354). However, there are exceptions, such as the permanent exhibition on Fascist and Nazi history that opened in 2014 in the Monument to Victory (1928) in Bolzano – a monument that was contentious not only for its Fascist origins, but also for its anti-German rhetoric, which offended a local German-speaking population (Hökerberg 2017). In general, Germany has tended towards destruction or isolation, whereas Italy has opted for preservation and re-use. The issue is not which approach is better, but how each suits a different national context.

Reasons for survival

There are a number of reasons why so much survives in Italy from the Fascist period – reasons which have to do with economics, politics, aesthetics and the national heritage. Undoubtedly, economic factors were key in the preservation of buildings. A vast portion of Italy's infrastructure was built under Fascism: including railway stations, ports, post offices, police headquarters, banks, schools, and buildings of local and national government. In post-war Italy, the nation's limited financial resources were largely invested in reconstruction rather than demolition. Thus, major institutions continued to occupy buildings that were created under the regime, offering striking symbols of the 'continuity of the state' (Pavone 1995, 70–159); as at the courthouse or Palazzo di Giustizia (1932) in Milan and the provincial headquarters (1934) in Naples (Figure 9). Fascist decoration was often embedded into the structure of such buildings and difficult to remove (Carter and Martin 2017, 347).

As ideological imperatives can also be hidden behind practical excuses, a political perspective yields a different view on the preservation of Fascist remains. Some observers see the survival of Fascist symbols as symptomatic of lingering Fascist tendencies (Arthurs 2010; Page 2014). For them, the lack of *damnatio memoriae* is proof of Italy's reluctance to engage with the legacy of Fascism. On the other hand, one could argue that preservation is more useful to the spread of democratic values than demolition as it maintains reminders of the past.[3] Others take the opposite position, claiming that the architecture of Fascism lost its political value with the fall of Mussolini's regime (Gundle 2013, 251; Maulsby 2014, 29, 32–3). In this light, the capacity of buildings to express political meanings is dependent on the power of its original creators. One might ask, then, whether commuters notice the fasces in the atrium of Milan's central station (1925–31), or whether tourists headed from Via del Corso to the Ara Pacis in Rome read the Fascist inscription in Piazza Augusto Imperatore (Figure 10).

In any case, the distracted acknowledgements of passers-by contrasts with the weighty polemics that have erupted around Fascist sites. One example of this is the square of the Ara Pacis by the Tiber in Rome, which was created after the foundation of the empire in 1936 to act as a showcase for Fascist ideals of *romanità* ('romaness'). The regime cleared the area around the ancient Mausoleum of Emperor Augustus (ca. 28 BCE) and reconstructed nearby the Augustan Ara Pacis (9 BCE), or Altar of Peace celebrating the establishment of the ancient Roman empire, which was excavated at a short distance on the other side of the Tiber (Seabrook 2005; Arthurs 2010, 114–15; 2012, 155; Kallis 2011; 2014, 99–105). The Augustan monuments were framed by buildings of the late 1930s whose decoration celebrated the glory

of the Fascist Empire, and turned the site into a stage set for Mussolini's imperial ambitions. The aim was to present Fascism as heir to Imperial Rome, and Mussolini as a successor to the Emperor Augustus (Nelis 2007, 405–7; Kallis 2011, 811; Arthurs 2012, 119, 131–4). In the early 1990s, Rome's centre-Left civic government launched a project to demolish the pavilion of 1938, which contained the Ara Pacis, on the grounds that it was in poor condition, and to build in its place a museum to be designed by the American architect Richard Meier – perhaps with the intention to 're-code' the symbolism of the site. The proposal to replace the Fascist-era pavilion with a building by a foreign architect provoked an outcry, particularly among critics on the Right who saw the demolition as a rejection of the Fascist legacy.[4] When elected Prime Minister in 2001, Silvio Berlusconi halted the project as a concession to his far-Right coalition partners, and ordered the restoration of the decorations on the Fascist-era buildings surrounding the piazza (Kallis 2014, 260). In an inscription embedded in one of the buildings at the corner of the piazza, 'Mussolini' had been abbreviated to 'Musso' ('donkey') after 1943, but was returned to its original state around 2001 (Figure 10; Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents 1999; Arthurs 2014, 283).[5]

When the museum was eventually completed in 2006 under the Left-wing mayor Walter Veltroni, its inauguration was disrupted by protestors associated with the neo-fascist Movimento Sociale Fiamma Tricolore (*La Repubblica* 21 and 22 April 2006). Completion did not put an end to the controversy. On his election as mayor of Rome in 2008, Gianni Alemanno of the 'post-Fascist' Alleanza Nazionale promised to destroy the new museum and to restore the piazza to the state in which it had existed under Fascism (*Corriere della Sera* 8 March 2008; *La Repubblica* 12 May 2008). Alemanno's supporters argued that the modernist style of Meier's new museum clashed with the stripped classicism of the Fascist-era buildings, and depleted the aesthetic integrity of the piazza (Evangelisti 2008). When asked in an interview for the *Sunday Times* in 2008 whether he saw anything positive in the Fascist legacy, Alemanno claimed that 'fascism was fundamental to modernizing Italy' and that architecture was 'part of the modernization process and gave importance to Italy's cultural identity' (Follain 2008). It is interesting that Alemanno saw modern architecture as an acceptable part of the Fascist legacy, perhaps because of its association with progress and artistic freedom. Yet, the vehemence of the controversy surrounding the Ara Pacis suggests that politics trumped aesthetic considerations, and that Fascist sites were still politically powerful, whether used to celebrate or repudiate Fascism (Arthurs 2010, 115).

That said, aesthetics has also been a major influence on preservation. For decades after the war, architects and historians ignored or denigrated Fascist-era architecture, until the 1980s brought calls to judge architects on their merits, rather than their politics (Zevi 1950; Ciucci 1982; 1989; Maulsby 2014, 33). It was perhaps a sign of the passage of time that appeals for architecture to be evaluated on aesthetic terms coincided with apolitical representations of Fascism in popular culture (Arthurs 2010, 124; Arthurs 2014, 283; Mammone 2006). As a result, critics now recognise the *ventennio* as one of the most innovative and successful periods in Italian architecture, and praise Fascist projects in a way that would be unthinkable for Nazi architecture in Germany (Samuels 2015). The breadth of Fascist aesthetics, which ranges from monumental neoclassicism to cutting-edge modernism, facilitated its reappraisal. Modernist buildings, whose abstract symbolism was less obviously Fascist, could be more easily disassociated from politics (Nicoloso 2012, 15–9; Pieri 2013, 233–4). Critical opinion has been less favourable towards traditional art and architecture, with the exception of classical decorations that could be appreciated for their antique appearance (Carter and Martin 2017, 359). One example of a building that was preserved largely on aesthetic grounds is the Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana (Palace of Italian Civilization) in Rome, which marries a stripped classicism with modernist influences. Originally, the Palazzo was part of a complex of monumental buildings built for the universal exposition, called E42, which was planned for the twentieth anniversary of the Fascist regime in 1942, but later cancelled due to the war. The re-named EUR formed the basis for a new district of Rome. The Palazzo, also known as the square colosseum, was created to house an exhibition on the 'primacy' of the Italian race and civilization, but, since 2013, it has accommodated the headquarters of the luxury fashion label Fendi (Figure 11; Etlin 1991, 484–5; Gentile 2007, 188–90; Hatherley 2015; Kirchgaessner 2015). When Fendi moved in, its chief executive Pietro Beccari echoed a rhetoric of *romanità* when he stated: 'We are proud to give back to our city, Rome, and to the whole world, the Palace of Italian Civilization, symbol of our Roman roots and of the continuing dialogue between tradition and modernity, values that have always been dear to Fendi' (Pamphili 2015; Fiorentino 2015; Luperini 2015).[6] Beccari rejected criticisms that Fendi was ignoring associations with Fascism on the grounds that: 'This building is beyond a discussion of politics. It is aesthetics. It is a masterpiece of architecture… For Italians and Romans, it is completely de-loaded, empty of any significance… We never saw it through the lens of fascism' (Kirchgaessner 2015). His statement shows that, in order to justify preservation on aesthetics grounds, buildings have to be stripped of their political content. In other words, aestheticisation

demands de-politicisation, or the mental separation of Fascist remains from the regime itself (Samuels 2015, 122).

The issue is whether it is possible to de-politicise architecture that has strong ties with the Fascist dictatorship. In 2013, the year in which the Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana was leased to Fendi, the building appeared on posters of Lotta Studentesca, the youth wing of the far-Right group Forza Nuova, which is represented by the Fascist symbol of the dagger (Figure 12). Thus, it is perhaps disingenuous to think that that buildings with a strong connection to Fascism can be stripped of all political associations and adopted as heritage sites. Perhaps as a form of poetic justice, the Palazzo was also used in posters that advertised the LGBTQ parade of Roma Pride in 2016, with the slogan ‘those who do not settle, fight’ (Figure 13). Whatever the motivations for choosing a Fascist monument to represent Roma Pride, the choice can be interpreted as a subversive act of appropriation. Initially, Fendi threatened to sue the parade’s organisers for ‘inappropriate use’ of the building, but the firm eventually backed down (Kirchgaessner 2016; Cillis and Venuti 2016). In any case, the fact that the Palazzo is deployed across the political divide shows how Fascist architecture is still a powerful symbol.

Another reason for the survival of Fascist-era architecture is a growing recognition of its importance within Italy’s heritage (Maulsby 2014, 33–4). Since the 1990s, buildings of the *ventennio* have been gradually accepted as part of the national patrimony. While this might reflect current trends to re-evaluate Fascism in a more positive light, it is also a sign that enough time has passed for architecture to be judged without ideological bias. The 1990s saw a growing appreciation of interwar modernism, which brought about the restoration of three flagship projects of the regime in Rome: EUR, Foro Mussolini and La Sapienza University. It is emblematic of changing attitudes that the Ministry of Culture (Ministero dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo) has recently listed a number of Fascist buildings. As exemplified by the former headquarters of the Fascist youth organization, Gioventù Italia del Littorio (GIL), nine buildings are listed across Italy – of which eight since 1995.[7] The ninth is a building of 1933–6 designed by Luigi Moretti in Rome’s Trastevere district, which was listed in 1984 and restored in 2013–15 for its value as a modernist masterpiece (D’Albergo 13 April 2017). This case also shows how restoration is not enough to create a heritage site. Without a plan for access or re-use, the former GIL headquarters have been empty since their restoration. In April 2017, the neo-Fascist group Forza Nuova occupied the building in protest against its neglect,

showing how 'uncritical preservation' leaves sites open to political appropriation (D'Albergo 22 April 2017; Di Corrado 2017).

Another former GIL building, in Forlì, was restored in 2009–11 and later used to accommodate two exhibitions on Fascist architecture curated by ATRIUM, an association that is dedicated to the cultural heritage of European totalitarian regimes.[8] Inspired by democratic principles, ATRIUM is intended to encourage the preservation of architecture created by dictatorships, while 'maintaining a critical and ethical repudiation' of totalitarianism.[9] With the institutional support of the Council of Europe, ATRIUM aims to promote an appreciation of architecture both for its quality and its historical value – which illustrates the dual role of aesthetics and heritage in the valorisation of Fascist buildings. The city council of Mussolini's birthplace of Predappio, at a short distance from Forlì, is a member of ATRIUM and its controversial proposal to establish a museum of Fascism in a former Fascist party headquarters might also be seen as part of the same process of 'heritagization', which converts Fascist buildings into heritage sites. While it is useful to acknowledge the historical importance of the *ventennio*, it is worth asking whether preservation implies any valorisation or legitimation of the regime. After all, concerns for Fascist heritage emerged at the same time as attempts to rehabilitate Fascism in public discourse (Pieri 2013, 236). Meanwhile, in an office building in Rome's EUR, the busts of Mussolini and Victor Emanuel III were restored to their position in a boardroom (Figure 14).

Recent debates

The third part of this article takes a more concrete approach and explores recent debates about the economic, political, aesthetic and heritage issues surrounding Fascist sites. From the 1990s, Fascist architecture has sparked a number of controversies in the Italian media, which have acted as conduits for discussions about the meaning of Fascism in contemporary Italy. It is significant that, over 70 years after Mussolini's death, Fascism is still the subject of debates – perhaps even more so than in the early post-war period. It is also interesting that polemics about Fascist-era buildings gained traction, from the 1990s, at the same time as calls to protect the regime's heritage and to revise the history of Fascism. On one hand, efforts to preserve the art of the *ventennio* might indicate a willingness to confront the past and to overcome Fascist/anti-Fascist dichotomies. On the other, revisionism might support the resurgence of the far Right, the entry into government of politicians with neo-Fascist backgrounds, and ongoing conflicts between (post-)Fascist and anti-

Fascist forces. Essentially, both tendencies responded to the weakening grip of anti-Fascism over Italian culture.

The vast sports complex of Foro Mussolini in Rome is a significant example of the neglect and re-use of Fascist sites. Built in 1928–38 under the direction of the architect Luigi Moretti as a training ground for the Fascist youth organization, Opera Nazionale Balilla (later GIL), the Foro serves today as Rome's main athletics centre and as the headquarters of the Italian Olympic Committee (Figure 15; Greco and Santuccio 1991; Gentile 2007, 99–106; Masia et al. 2007). The largest of the regime's interventions into the Roman cityscape, it comprised a number of different sports facilities, including an elliptical running track encircled by statues of muscular male nudes (Figure 16). The main entrance was marked by an obelisk inscribed with 'Mussolini dux', and led to a vast square called Piazzale dell'Impero, which was decorated with mosaics depicting scenes from mythology, antiquity, sport and Fascist life (Figure 17; D'Amelio 2009). Architecturally, the Foro reflects an interplay between tradition and modernity, in that its main buildings are in a classical style, whereas its secondary buildings embody the sparse aesthetic of modernism. Under Fascism, sport was more than just leisure, as it was meant to shape the minds and bodies of future generations, to cultivate the race, and to prepare for war (Greco and Santuccio 1991, 83–4). As a showcase for Fascist ideals of fitness and beauty, the Foro was a concrete expression of the regime's plans for 'the future legions of Fascist Italy' (Figure 18).[10] As 'the greatest experiment of state education in history', it was thought of as 'a monument that … would perpetuate across the ages the memory of the new fascist civilization' (Santuccio 2005, 149; Gentile 2007, 99; Carter and Martin 2017, 342). Contemporaries stressed that it was not a utilitarian complex, but an 'affirmation of the imperialist will of Fascism' (quote in Gentile 2007, 104). In this respect, the Foro can be compared to the Nuremberg rally grounds as a stage for ceremonies, a showpiece for foreign dignities, and a symbol of the regime (Pooley 2013, 213; Carter and Martin 2017, 342).

After 1943, the Foro escaped destruction because it was designated as a rest centre for Allied military personnel. In fact, American soldiers reportedly stopped Romans from demolishing the Foro's obelisk (Caporilli and Simeoni 1990, 265; Gentile 2007, 257). Following the departure of the Allies, the mosaics, paintings and inscriptions were restored to host the 1960 Olympics, but the Foro came under attack from Leftist members of Parliament, who demanded the erasure of Fascist symbols, and used their continued existence to accuse the Christian Democrat government of complacency towards Fascism (Vidotto 2004, 113–4; Arthurs 2014, 290; Martin 2017, 68). The

government agreed to remove some of the Fascist decoration, but the removal works were hampered by neo-Fascists, backed by the Movimento Sociale Italiano, who staged protests, planted bombs, and distributed leaflets with the slogan 'history must not be erased' ('*La storia non ci cancella*', La Stampa 1960; see also Arthurs 2014, 290). Eventually, the government gave in to pressure from the extreme Right and adopted a compromise. Only two of the most inflammatory inscriptions were erased, and three dates were added to the marble blocks in the Piazzale dell'Impero to mark the overthrow of the Fascist regime (1943), the creation of the Italian Republic (1946) and the Italian Constitution (1948). Thus, rather than erasing the Fascist past, the authorities updated the original historical timeline with the unintended effect of suggesting a continuation of the state through Fascism (Martin 2017, 69).

After gaining the status of a protected site, the Foro underwent a second, more extensive, restoration for the Football Championships of 1990 (Carter and Martin 2017, 252). The Foro's administration published a collection of essays with the aim to refute criticisms of the restoration. While one author rejects any connection between Fascism and the architecture of the Foro, another welcomes the reappraisal of Fascist architecture 'whether it is because of fashion, or because time has given a sense of perspective' (Caporilli and Simenoni 1990, 7 and 57). In the same publication, an expert in architectural restoration condemns the 'shameful conditions' of the Foro as the result of 'the neglect, or even obtuse criminalization, of art from the "*ventennio*"' (Caporilli and Simenoni 1990, 309). These comments mark a growing appreciation of the Foro's value as a heritage site.

Around this time, an unusual alliance emerged between two groups with different agendas (Arthurs 2010, 122). In one group, there were those who supported preservation of the Foro on artistic grounds, such as Italia Nostra, a major association for the protection of Italian heritage.[11] In the other, there were those on the far-Right who denounced the Foro's disrepair, and called for its restoration as a homage to Mussolini.[12] Thus, calls for preservation stemmed from a recognition of artistic value and from far-Right politics, as historical preservationists and neo-Fascists adopted kindred positions. Despite their common concerns, the two groups were at opposite ends of the political spectrum, as efforts to preserve Fascist sites generally came from anti-Fascists who hoped that preservation would help Italians come to terms with the past. For a post-Communist Left, heritage offered a chance to understand the Fascist legacy. Preservation was meant to help depolarize the political system, build a shared system of values and set anti-Fascism on a stronger footing. For instance, as Nick Carter and Simon Martin (2017, 352–3) have shown,

forces on the Left drove the restoration in 1997–2000 of a mural called the *Apotheosis of Fascism* in the Foro's Academy of Physical Education. The mural, representing Mussolini and his leaders in the mode of Christ and his disciples, had previously been covered, but Leftist politicians and civil servants held that its exposure would serve as a reminder to future generations (Carter and Martin 2017, 356; Pooley 2013, 125). The restoration was overseen by the then Minister of Culture, Veltroni, formerly a communist deputy and centre-Left mayor of Rome, who in an interview in 2013 said that 'To condemn [Fascism] we need to understand, historicize and rationalize it, not remove it' (La Stampa, 23 March 2013, quoted in Carter and Martin 2017, 353). This illustrates how restoration originated from anti-Fascist efforts to combat revisionism and to renew democratic values. Equally, the project to establish a museum of Fascism in Predappio is being led by the centre-Left mayor Giorgio Frassineti, formerly of the PCI. Whatever the intentions of such initiatives, the lack of critical preservation can give rise to misunderstanding and misappropriation (Vidotto 2004, 121; Arthurs 2010, 124–5; Carter and Martin 2017, 355; Hökerberg 2017, 771).

A case in point is that, in April 2015, the Foro was again at the centre of debates that followed an off-the-cuff remark made by the then President of the Chamber of Deputies, Laura Boldrini, at a ceremony to celebrate the 70th anniversary of Liberation. A former partisan suggested to President Boldrini that 'we should do something to cleanse fascism, which is coming back, from all the streets of Italy' and proposed to demolish the Foro's obelisk (see Figure 16).[13] Boldrini answered that 'at least it is time to remove the writing', referring to the inscription 'Mussolini dux'. While Boldrini's statement might appear unremarkable, it caused uproar in the Italian media. Most of the political establishment, on both Left and Right, came out against the idea of removing the inscription. Interestingly, this represented a change in position from similar debates in 1960. On the Left of the political spectrum, the President of the Democratic Party (PD), Matteo Orfini, stated that: 'We are an anti-fascist country…[and] We have no need to erase our memory', thus claiming anti-Fascism as an antidote to any threat posed by Fascist monuments (*La Repubblica* 17 and 18 April 2015). In turn, the leader of the Moderates, Giacomo Portas, asked: 'The *Ventennio* is dead and buried, what does it matter now?' (*Il Messaggero* 17 April 2017). Meanwhile, on the Right, Senator Andrea Augello of the Nuovo Centrodestra, who had been a member of the neo-Fascist Movimento Sociale Italiano and of the post-Fascist Alleanza Nazionale, stressed that the buildings are no longer to be considered as propaganda, but as architecture (*Il Tempo* 18 April 2015) – a statement that supports a de-politicised view of architecture. Similarly, a representative for Forza Italia, Dario Rossin, mobilised arguments in defence of 'the artistic and architectural patrimony' (*Corriere della Sera* 17 April 2015). If, as Augello claimed, the buildings of Foro Mussolini no longer hold any political

value, how can we explain public reactions to President Boldrini's statement? Boldrini was attacked in both print and social media, with Right-wing newspapers describing her a 'red fury' ('*furia rossa'*, Valenza 2015; *Il Tempo* 17 April 2015; Sabatini 2015). Responses included a campaign on facebook to take selfies in front of the obelisk on 25 April, as the anniversary of Italy's Liberation, which used as a hashtag the slogan adopted by neo-Fascist groups in 1960: 'history must not be erased' ('*La storia non si cancella*'). This suggests that, in broad terms, the position of the Right has not changed between 1960 and 2015, while opinions on the Left have shifted in favour of preservation.

This episode illustrates the difficulties surrounding the architectural legacy of Fascism. The question is whether such debates reveal surviving Fascist mentalities, or whether Fascism is being appropriated to serve new political forces. Another issue is whether such debates are symptomatic of a crisis in the Italian polity, or of a healthy effort to tackle the past. In any case, these sites are flashpoints for conflict, and political instruments deployed on both sides of an ideological debate. Fascist-era sites are being used as weapons in political struggles, rather than as sources for national reconciliation or meaningful introspection.

Conclusion

Christopher Duggan proposed to explore the legacies of Fascism, and the manner in which memories of the regime were passed to later generations. That proposal had the potential to shed light on the marks left by Fascism on politics and culture in present-day Italy. Its timing was apt, as it emerged when history was being distorted to serve current political interests. The project identified a broad range of sources through which to study the 'afterlife' of Fascism. One source lies in architecture that perpetuates memories in the places of everyday life. In the spirit of Duggan's unfinished project, this article has examined attitudes towards Fascist remains, as expressive of different ways in which the past has, or has not, been integrated into public memory. Three approaches characterise how Italy has dealt with the architectural legacy of Fascism – destruction, neglect and recycling – of which the latter was the most common. As a result, much survives from the *ventennio*, as buildings are preserved on economic, political, aesthetic or heritage grounds. The ubiquity of physical traces contrasts with the concealment of Fascism in some areas of Italian life, but both suggest the existence of a basic urge to forget. In many ways, the processes whereby buildings are destroyed, ignored or altered mirror how memories are shaped by each generation. The processes of selection and manipulation are

always rooted in contemporary politics. Even when buildings are preserved for aesthetic reasons, evidence suggests that architecture is not been completely aestheticised or de-politicised. On the contrary, recent debates surrounding the preservation of Italy's Fascist heritage show how both Left and Right instrumentalise architecture, or use it to push their own agendas. This article identifies a shift in attitudes towards the architecture of Fascism that first emerged in the 1990s. Whereas, in the post-war period, a 'collective amnesia' supported the neglect or re-use of Fascist sites, over the last two decades, calls for preservation have arisen from forces that try in different ways to harness the public memory of Fascism. Perhaps, in the future, Fascist sites might become the subject of critical preservation and public education, but for now, they are caught up in the political battles of today.

Bibliography

Arthurs, J. 2010. 'Fascism as "heritage" in contemporary Italy'. In *Italy Today: The Sick Man of* Europe, edited by A. Mammone and G. A. Veltri, 114–28. London: Routledge. [Published in Italian: 2011. 'Il fascismo come "eredità" nell'Italia contemporanea'. In *Un Paese normale? Saggi sull'Italia contemporanea*, edited by A. Mammone, N. Tranfaglia, and G. A. Veltri, 209–32. Milan: Dalai Editore.]

Arthurs J. 2012. *Excavating Modernity: The Roman Past in Fascist Italy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Arthurs, J. 2014. '"Voleva essere Cesare, morì Vespasiano": The Afterlives of Mussolini's Rome', *Civiltà Romana: Rivista pluridisciplinare di studi su Roma antica e le sue interpretazioni* I: 283–302.

Battini, M. 2003. *Peccati di memoria: La mancata Norimberga*. Bari: Laterza. [Published in English as: M. Battini. 2007. *The Missing Italian Nuremberg: Cultural Amnesia and Postwar Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.]

Benton, T. 1999. 'From the Arengario to the Lictor's Axe: Memories of Italian Fascism'. In *Material Memories: Design and Evocation*, edited by M. Kwint, C. Breward and J. Aynsley, 199–218. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Bosworth, R.J.B. and P. Dogliani. 2001. 'Introduction'. In *Italian Fascism: History, Memory, Representation*, 1–9. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Caporilli, M. and F. Simeoni (ed.). 1990. *Il Foro Italico e lo Stadio Olimpico: immagini dalla storia*. Rome: Tomo edizioni.

Carter, N. and S. Martin. 2017. ‘The management and memory of fascist monumental art in postwar and contemporary Italy: the case of Luigi Montanarini’s Apotheosis of Fascism’, *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 22, 3: 338–64

Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents. 1999. ‘Epigraphy and its Afterlife: Reusing, rediscovering, reinventing, and revitalising ancient inscriptions’, *Newsletter* 7, Spring.

Cillis, A. R. and L. Venuti. 2016. ‘Colosseo quadrato per promuovere il Roma Pride, dietrofront di Fendi: “Uso autorizzato, equivoco chiarito”’, *Repubblica* (9 June).

Corner, P. 2002. ‘Italian Fascism: Whatever Happened to Dictatorship?’, *The Journal of Modern History* 74, 2 (June): 325–51.

Corner, P. 2005. ‘La percezione del fascismo nell’Italia di oggi’, *Giornale di Storia Contemporanea* 8, 1: 176–83.

Corriere della Sera. 17 April 2015. ‘Boldrini: “Cancellare la scritta Dux dall’obelisco di Mussolini”. Bufera sulla presidente della Camera’.

Corriere della Sera. 8 March 2008. ‘Ara Pacis, Alemanno “Stop al progetto”’.

D’Albergo, L. 13 April 2017. ‘Roma, L’ex palazzo Gil: Un pachiderma abbandonato nel cuore di Trastevere’. *La Repubblica*.

D’Albergo, L. 22 April 2017. ‘Roma, ex Gil di Trastevere: altri due milioni dalla Regione per la riapertura a luglio’. *La Repubblica*.

D’Amelio, M. G. 2009. *L’obelisco marmoreo del Foro Italico a Roma : storia, immagini e note tecniche*. Rome: Palombi.

De Felice, R. 1995. *Rosso e Nero*. Milan: Baldini & Castoldi.

De Guttry, I. 2001. *Guida di Roma moderna: architettura dal 1870 a oggi*. Rome: De Luca.

Di Corrado, V. 22 April 2017. ‘Forza Nuova occupa l’ex Gil di Trastevere, restaurato e poi abbandonato’, *Il Tempo*.

Dondi, M. 2001. ‘The Fascist Mentality after Fascism’. In *Italian Fascism: History, Memory, Representation*, edited by R.J.B. Bosworth and P. Dogliani, 141–60. New York: St. Martin’s Press.

Etlin, R. 1991. *Modernism in Italian architecture, 1890-1940*. London: The MIT Press.
Evangelisti, M. 2008. ‘Alemanno: “Ara Pacis, via quella teca”, *Il Messaggero*. 1 May.

Fiorentino, F. 2015. ‘Apre il «Colosseo quadrato», la sfida (vinta) di Fendi’, *Corriere della Sera* (23 October). Available: http://www.corriere.it/moda/news/15_ottobre_22/roma-apre-colosseo-quadrato-sfida-vinta-fendi-ff26d5e6-78ef-11e5-95d8-a1e2a86e0e17.shtml. [Accessed: 15 March 2017].

Fogu, C. 2006. ‘Italiani brava gente: the Legacy of Fascist Historical Culture on Italian Politics of Memory’. In *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, edited by R.N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner, and C. Fogu, 147–76. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Follain, J. 2008. ‘Italy needed fascism, says the new Duce’, *The Sunday Times*. 11 May.

Foot, J. 2009. *Italy’s divided memory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gallerano, N. 1988. ‘Gli italiani in guerra 1940–1943: appunti per una ricerca’. In *L’Italia nella Seconda Guerra Mondiale e nella Resistenza*, edited by F. Ferratini Tosi, G. Grassi and M. Legnani, 316–21. Milan: Franco Angeli.

Gentile, E. 2007. *Il fascismo di pietra*. Rome: Laterza.

Greco, A. and S. Santuccio. 1991. *Foro italico*. Rome: Multigrafica.

Hatherley, O. 2015. ‘Fendi vidi vici: when Fashion flirts with Fascism’, *Architectural Review*, online. https://www.architectural-review.com/rethink/viewpoints/fendi-vidi-vici-when-fashion-flirts-with-fascism/8679074.article. [Accessed: 15 March 2017].

Hökerberg, H. 2017. ‘The Monument to Victory in Bolzano: desacralisation of a fascist relic’, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23:8, 759-74.

Il Messaggero. 17 April 2015, ‘Laura Boldrini: “Togliere la scritta “Mussolini Dux” dall’obelisco del Foro Italico’.

Il Tempo. 17 April 2015. ‘La talebana Boldrini Via @Dux” dall’obelisco’

Il Tempo, 18 April 2015, ‘Boldrini cancellata a sinistra’

Kallis, A. 2011. ‘“Framing” Romanità: The Celebrations for the Bimillenario Augusteo and the Augusteo—Ara Pacis Project’, *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 809–831.

Kallis, A. 2014. *The Third Rome, 1922–43: The Making of the Fascist Capital*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kirchgaessner, S. 2015. ‘Fendi rejects criticism over new HQ in Mussolini propaganda building’, *The Guardian* (22 October)

Kirchgaessner, S. 2016. ‘Fendi forced to retract opposition to Roma Pride using image of HQ’, *The Guardian* (9 June).

La Repubblica. 12 May 2008. ‘Roma, Sgarbi consulente di Alemanno Via il muro alla teca dell’Ara Pacis’.

La Repubblica. 17 April 2015. ‘Fascismo, Boldrini: “Togliere la scritta Dux dall’obelisco del Foro”.
La Repubblica. 18 April 2015. ‘Orfini: la scritta Dux non va cancellata’

La Repubblica. 21 April 2006. ‘L’Ara Pacis riapre dopo sette anni. Ma è scontro sulla teca di Meier’.

La Repubblica. 22 April 2006. ‘Ara pacis, la teca di Meier una gesta tra le polemiche’.

La Stampa. 11 August 1960. ‘Chiassare di missini a Roma per le scritte al Foro Italico’.

Ladd, B. 1997. *The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting German History in the Urban Landscape*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Luperini, S. 2015. ‘E l’icona metafisica ritorna alla città’, *La Repubblica* (24 October).

Luzzatto, S. 2004. *La crisi dell’antifascismo*. Turin: Einaudi.

Luzzatto, S. 2011 (first published 1998). *Il corpo del duce. Un cadavere tra immaginazione, storia e memoria*. Turin: Einaudi.

Macdonald, S. 2006. ‘Undesirable heritage: Fascist material culture and historical consciousness in Nuremberg’, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12, 1: 9–28.

Macdonald, S. 2009. *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and beyond*. London: Routledge.

Malone, H. Forthcoming 2017. ‘Marcello Piacentini: A case of controversial heritage’. In *Architecture as Propaganda in Twentieth-Century Totalitarian Regimes. History and Heritage*. Rome: Suecoromana.

Mammone, A. 2006. ‘A daily revision of the past: Fascism, anti-fascism, and memory in contemporary Italy’, *Modern Italy*, 11 (2): 211–26.

Martin, S. 2017. ‘Rebranding the Republic: Rome and the 1960 Olympic Games’, *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* 24, 1: 58–79.

Masia, L., D. Matteoni, P. Mei, and M. Beck Peccoz (ed.). 2007. *Il parco del Foro Italico: la storia, lo sport, i progetti*. Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana.

Maulsby, L. M. 2014. 'Drinking from the River Lethe: Case del Fascio and the Legacy of Fascism in Postwar Italy', *Future Anterior* 11 (2): 18–39.

Nelis, J. 2007. 'Constructing Fascist Identity: Benito Mussolini and the Myth of "Romanità"', *The Classical World* 100, 4: 391–415.

Nicoloso, P. 2012. *Architetture per un'identità italiana: Progetti e opere per fare gli italiani fascisti*. Udine: P. Gaspari.

Page, Max. 2014. 'The Roman architecture of Mussolini, still standing', *Boston Globe* (13 July). https://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2014/07/12/the-roman-architecture-mussolini-still-standing/csZ70EN2fTnUUNqX0kRM9K/story.html [accessed 6 July 2017]

Pamphili, C.T. 2015. 'Fendi, il Colosseo Quadrato e le polemiche', *Artribune* (31 October).

Pavone, C. 1995. *Alle Origini della Repubblica: Scritti su Fascismo, Antifascismo e Continuità dello Stato*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri.

Pavone, C. 2000. 'Negazionismi, rimozioni, revisionismi: storia o politica?'. In *Fascismo e antifascismo. Rimozioni, revisioni, negazioni*, 15–42. Rome: Laterza.

Petrusewicz, M. 2004. 'Preface. The hidden pages of contemporary Italian history: war crimes, war guilt and collective memory', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 9, 3: 269–70.

Pieri, G. 'The destiny of the art and artefacts'. In *The Cult of the Duce: Mussolini and the Italians*, edited by Stephen Gundle, Christopher Duggan and Giuliana Pieri, 227–40. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Pooley, E. 'Mussolini and the city of Rome'. In *The Cult of the Duce: Mussolini and the Italians*, edited by Stephen Gundle, Christopher Duggan and Giuliana Pieri, 209–24. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Rosenfeld, G. D. 2000. *Munich and Memory: Architecture, Monuments, and the Legacy of the Third Reich*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rosenfeld, G. D. and P. B. Jaskot. 2008. *Beyond Berlin: Twelve German Cities Confront the Nazi Past*. Detroit: University of Michigan Press.

Roy Domenico, R.P. 1991. *Italian Fascists on Trial, 1943–1948*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Sabatini, G. 17 April 2017, ‘La Boldrini vuole abbattere la stele di Mussolini. Come i talebani dell’Isis’, *Secolo d’Italia.*

Samuels, J. 2015. ‘Coming “To Terms” with Sicily’s Fascist Past’. In *Heritage Keywords: Rhetoric and Redescription in Cultural Heritage*, edited by Trinidad Rico and Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels, 111–28. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

Santuccio, S., ed. 2005. *Le case e il foro. L’architettura dell’ONB*. Florence: Alinea.

Seabrook, J. 2005. ‘Roman Renovation: Can Richard Meier undo what Augustus and Mussolini wrought?’, *New Yorker*, 2 May.

Storchi, S. 2013. ‘Mussolini as Monument: The Equestrian Statue of the Duce at the Littoriale Stadium in Bologna’. In *The Cult of the Duce: Mussolini and the Italians*, edited by Stephen Gundle, Christopher Duggan and Giuliana Pieri, 193–208. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Tranfaglia, N. 1996*. Un passato scomodo: Fascismo e postfascismo*. Rome: Laterza.

Valenza, M. 17 April 2017. ‘Laura Boldrini: “Cancellate la scritta Dux”, *Il Giornale.*

Ventresca, R. 2006. ‘Debating the Meaning of Fascism in Contemporary Italy’, *Modern Italy* 11, 2 (1 June): 189–209.

Vidotto, V. 2004. ‘Il mito di Mussolini e le memorie nazionali: Le trasformazioni del Foro Italico 1937–1960’. In *Roma: Architettura e città negli anni della seconda Guerra mondiale*, edited by Andrea Bruschi, 112–21. Rome: Gangemi.

Zevi, B. 1950. *Storia dell’architettura moderna*: *Dalle origini al 1950*. Rome.

---

[1] Christopher Duggan, email correspondence, 23 February 2015.

[2] Exceptions include: Benton 1999; Vidotto 2004; Arthurs 2010; Kallis 2014, 259–64; Maulsby 2014; Carter and Martin 2017; Honneberg 2017.

[3] G. D. Rosenfeld 2000, 262–3; Carter and Martin 2017, 355.

[4] http://dibattitoarapacis.blogspot.co.uk/2008/05/alemanno-ara-pacis-via-quella-teca.html

[5] The exact timing is unclear, but falls between 1999 and 2002.

[6] All translations are by the author unless specified.

[7] http://vincoliinrete.beniculturali.it/VincoliInRete/vir/utente/login

[8] http://www.atriumroute.eu/news-and-activities/news/107-forli-citta-del-novecento-il-festival

[9] http://www.atriumroute.eu/atrium/atrium-cultural-route

[10] Quote from an inscription at the site.

[11] http://www.italianostra.org/?p=49537

[12] http://foroitalico.altervista.org/secondapagina.htm

[13]http://roma.repubblica.it/cronaca/2015/04/17/news/fascismo_boldrini_togliere_la_scritta_dux_dall_obelisco_del_foro_-112185661/