

About Fiume

Giuseppe Civile*

This article analyses a selection of recent studies about the political life of Fiume between 1919 and 1920, most of which were published on the occasion of the centenary of Gabriele D'Annunzio's march on the city. The examined texts offer a re-reading of different themes: the city's pre-war history, the role of the army, the city's relation with post-war Italy and Fascism, the interpretation of new theories and political practices, and D'Annunzio's influence on individual and collective actors. Taken together, these recent studies demonstrate that the debate on Fiume is still alive and open to new interpretations, in terms of both specific themes and more general interpretations.

Key words: First post-war period, Italy 1918-1921, The Fiume crisis, Gabriele D'Annunzio

It is well known that, from September 1919 and throughout 1920, Fiume attracted general attention both in Italy and internationally. In terms of historical reflections (but not only), this attention can be said to have continued throughout the following century.

Many scholars have considered the case of Fiume evidence of a situation that was common to a large part of Europe in the first post-war period: social and political disorder, co-existence and overlapping of radical and opposing cultural and ideological positions, and a tendency towards direct and violent action. A good, recent example is the work of Robert Gerwarth.¹ Others have described Fiume as a laboratory, circumscribed in space and time, in which the themes and practices of the new politics that would mark the first half of the twentieth century were tested.² Whether the emphasis is placed on the immediate post-war period or the forthcoming advent of totalitarianism, these

* Università degli studi "L'Orientale"; giuscivi@gmail.com

¹ Robert Gerwarth, *La rabbia dei vinti, 1917-1923*, Rome-Bari, Laterza, 2019 (first edition 2016).

² See, among others, Mark Mazower, *Le ombre d'Europa. Democrazie e totalitarismi nel XX secolo*, Milan, Garzanti, 2000 (first edition 1999); Adam J. Tooze, *The Deluge: The Great War, America and the Remaking of the Global Order, 1916-1931*, New York, Viking Adult, 2014.

studies give the Fiume episode a relevant position in the continental context of a process that we could define — borrowing Charles Maier's expression — as the recasting of bourgeois Europe,³ leaving the connection with Italian history in the background.

Dominique Kirchner Reill proposed yet another perspective in a recent monograph dedicated to Fiume.⁴ Reill evokes a typology consisting of more or less vast communities that had remained orphans after the waning of empires (the Austro-Hungarian one in particular); the theme of the book is their effort to keep alive the rules and practices that once guaranteed their existence. In other words, continuity versus change; in this sense, Fiume — from the end of the war and until it was swallowed up by the Fascist regime — offers a good example of the defence of continuity, which the author analyses by exploring unfamiliar yet interesting paths, such as the school system and monetary circulation. Obscured by nationalist and Dannunzian rhetoric, the city's pragmatic choice — made by an elite that expressed itself above all in the National Council — was to opt for Italy as the best solution towards maintaining a protected autonomy. This explains the consensus for D'Annunzio's enterprise, the generally quiet co-existence with the legionnaires, the tolerance towards a regime that was radical in words more than anything else and governed by a Vate ("prophet") who, "for fifteen months without doing much else", dedicated his time to reciting from a balcony.⁵ Finally, Reill draws attention to a neglected but central theme: the living conditions of the Fiuman population and, starting from these, the material and cultural reasons behind its confrontation — moving from consensus to conflict — with the Dannunzian experience. Viewed from a different perspective, this approach takes nothing away from the political and ideological importance of the Fiuman experiment.

The historiography on Italy, which is the exclusive focus of the sample of texts examined below, has obviously taken a different direction. Squeezed between two decisive phases of national history, the Great War and Fascism, from the beginning the Fiume affair — an exemplary even if not a typical case of that crucial conjuncture — has been the object of particular attention that has never failed over time, as the over two hundred titles listed in the bibliography of a recent publication demonstrate.⁶

Broadly speaking, it can be said that post-war research initially concentrated its efforts on a strictly political analysis before it gave the event a more specific

³ Charles Maier, *La rifondazione dell'Europa borghese*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1979 (first edition 1975).

⁴ Dominique Kirchner Reill, *The Fiume Crisis. Life in the Wake of the Habsburg Empire*, Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England, Harvard University Press, 2020.

⁵ D.K. Reill, *The Fiume Crisis*, cit. p. 68.

⁶ Mimmo Franzinelli, Paolo Cavassini, *Fiume. Un racconto per immagini dell'impresa di D'Annunzio*, Gorizia, LEG Edizioni, 2019.

position within the Italian general framework.⁷ In a second phase, scholars such as Mosse, De Felice and Leeden examined the events of Fiume in relation to the cultural and social drives and suggestions that marked this specific phase, broadening and developing the overall picture.⁸ At the same time, scholars undertook an internal analysis of the movement's various contrasting components and different phases. This opened up more wide-ranging research perspectives that paved the way for Emilio Gentile's comprehensive reinterpretation, on the one hand, and highly distinct analyses such as that offered by Claudia Salaris, on the other.⁹

It was therefore to be expected that the hundredth anniversary would give rise to commemorations and polemics but also to new historiographical reflections.¹⁰ Not surprisingly, the first publications often focused on a discussion of the post-war period, from Fascism to the second post-war years; more recent contributions, instead, seem to confirm that the subject has not yet been fully explored. It is also worth noting how, a hundred years later, new documentary and biographical evidence still emerged, even quite frequently; this confirms — among other things — that the decision to participate in that adventure was largely connected to the prospect of turning it into a story that was memorable for all.¹¹ This relevance often seemed to be announced and guaranteed by the highly common recurrence — in the book titles — of the expression “with D’Annunzio”, which ends up referring to what still seems to be a widespread common sense: the fact that the Commander can represent all aspects of the Fiume affair.

For a long time now, historians have acknowledged that D’Annunzio’s strategic role in the Fiume enterprise must be positioned within a network of relationships with other important players, both at an individual and a collective level. Likewise, a multitude of threads link the Dannunzian image of the city, alone and “holocausted” against the world, to an “outside” that is both Italian

⁷ Paolo Alatri, *Nitti, D’Annunzio e la questione adriatica*, Milan, Feltrinelli, 1959; Roberto Vivarelli, *Storia delle origini del fascismo, vol. I*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1967.

⁸ George Mosse, *Il poeta e l’esercizio del potere politico*, in George Mosse, *L’uomo e le masse nelle ideologie nazionaliste*, Rome-Bari, Laterza, 1982, cit. pp. 97-115 (first edition 1973); Renzo De Felice, *D’Annunzio politico*, Rome-Bari, Laterza, 1978; Michael A. Ledeen, *D’Annunzio a Fiume*, Rome-Bari, Laterza, 1975. At least in the case of Mosse and De Felice, these indications are purely illustrative compared to the wealth of suggestions that their entire production also offers with respect to the Fiume case.

⁹ Emilio Gentile, *Il mito dello Stato nuovo dall’antigiolittismo al fascismo*, Rome-Bari, Laterza, 1982; Emilio Gentile, *Le origini dell’ideologia fascista*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1996; Claudia Salaris, *Alla festa della rivoluzione. Artisti e libertari con D’Annunzio a Fiume*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2002. The observation made in the previous note also applies to Gentile.

¹⁰ See, for example, the report by Raffaele Oriani: *Ricordare Fiume: un’impresa*, in “Venerdì di Repubblica” of 6 September 2019.

¹¹ See, among others, Haruchi Shimoi, *Un samurai a Fiume*, edited by G.A. Pautasso, Sesto San Giovanni, Oaks Editrice, 2019, and Giovanna Latour, Filippo Sallusto, *1920-21. Diario fumano: dalle carte di Luigi De Michelis*, Rome, Ricciardi e Associati, 2019.

and European. Nonetheless, the recourse to images from D'Annunzio's narrative also permeates those analytical studies that — given their analytical precision — have nothing to do with it. Looking at our sample, this is the case of Pupo, Serventi Longhi and Guerri. It is as if they fail to escape the rhetorical perimeter traced by the Commander, which furthermore contains highly appealing hints and suggestions.

A few other, general impressions merit attention. First, the persistent tendency to trace in Fiume the upcoming Fascist era rather than the imprint of the Great War that had just ended; second, the frequent yet methodologically indeterminate use of the term “revolution”, which seems to raise more problems than it solves; third, the more or less explicit and justified comparisons with other episodes in contemporary history, above all the events of 1968 and beyond; lastly, and marginally, the recourse to present-day terminologies or situations that could help explain the case and probably also appeal to an audience of non-experts. Without going into detail here and saving some of my considerations for later, I would like to point out the risk — common to more or less all these tendencies — of decontextualising the analysis as well as the reader's perception.

In this article, I will try to make some less general observations on a group of recently published works.¹² While this, too, is a reductive choice, I nevertheless consider it useful because of the variety and clarity of the chosen analytical and interpretative approaches, and because — at a glance — interconnections and possible reciprocal cross-references clearly emerge despite the differences, thus confirming the density of the case under examination. In my opinion, their juxtaposition also testifies to the fact that the discussion among historians is still open on various fronts, and that much room for reflection remains for those who take an interest in the Fiume affair.

I have chosen to discuss the following publications: Raul Pupo, *Fiume città di passione* (Fiume city of passion), Rome-Bari, Laterza, 2018; Marco Mondini, *Fiume 1919. Una guerra civile italiana* (Fiume 1919. An Italian civil war), Salerno, Rome, 2019; Lucio Villari, *La luna di Fiume. 1919: il complotto* (The moon over Fiume. 1919: the conspiracy), Milan, Guanda, 2019; Enrico Serventi Longhi, *Il faro del mondo nuovo. D'Annunzio e i legionari a Fiume tra guerra e rivoluzione* (The lighthouse of the new world. D'Annunzio and the legionnaires of Fiume between war and revolution), Udine, Gaspari, 2019; Claudia Salaris, *Alla festa della rivoluzione. Artisti e libertari con D'Annunzio a Fiume* (At the revolution party. Artists and libertarians with D'Annunzio in

¹² These include: Giordano Bruno Guerri (ed.), *Fiume 1919-2019. Un centenario europeo tra identità, memorie e prospettive di ricerca*, Gardone Riviera, Silvana, 2020; Federico Carlo Simonelli, *D'Annunzio e il mito di Fiume*, Pisa, Pacini, 2021; and the useful review by Federico Carlo Simonelli, *Fiume e D'Annunzio. I cento anni di un caso storiografico ancora aperto*, in “Storicamente”, n. 15-16, 2019-20, cit. pp.1-17.

Fiume), Bologna, Il Mulino, 2002-2019; and Giordano Bruno Guerri, *Disobbedisco. Cinquecento giorni di rivoluzione. Fiume 2019-2020* (I disobey. Fifty days of revolution. Fiume 2019-2020), Milan, Mondadori, 2019. Although Salaris's work actually dates back to 2002, the combination of the themes of culture and "celebration" still makes it a point of reference in this field, in that it promotes a non-superficial analysis of some of the most misused aspects of the Fiume affair. In fact, the book was republished on the occasion of the centenary and enriched by an essay on *D'Annunzio e le avanguardie* (D'Annunzio and the avant-gardes), a useful contribution that marks the distance — even in the mid-twentieth century — between D'Annunzio and futurism and, accordingly, the partiality of the futurist imprint on the Fiume experience that is examined in the text.

Before and after

Raul Pupo's *Fiume città di passione* not only deals with the events of 1919 and 1920 but also offers a synthesis of the city's history in contemporary times, from the eighteenth century to its conversion into Rijeka in the second post-war period.

Two chapters out of a total of six (namely the second and third chapter) are dedicated to the events under examination here. The centrality of D'Annunzio is nevertheless confirmed not only by the choice of title, but also by the brief introductory prologue, which is entirely dedicated to the events of Fiume and their relationship with the contemporary Italian situation. This peculiar beginning leaves in the background the assumption that the specific case can be better clarified by broadening the perspective — in a diachronic sense — to the Fiume context.

Pupo's book is an important contribution: the presentation is perspicuous yet engaging, the contextualisation of the local event in the Italian and European framework clear and effective. Additionally, this approach forces readers to redirect their attention, first of all by reversing the usual connection between Fiume and D'Annunzio. The city is no longer a part of D'Annunzio's trajectory; instead, the Commander's presence and action become part of a broader affair that affects all citizens.

The broader chronological perspective also enables the author to highlight the endogenous factors that contributed to the crisis of 1919. What undermined the foundations of Fiume's development (i.e. its ethnic and cultural hybridism, the protected autonomy within the Empire, economic integration with a vast hinterland) was first and foremost the growth of the aggressive nationalisms of the late nineteenth century, which turned traditional autonomist positions against Italy and generated a younger and more enterprising irredentism. The war permanently cancelled those foundations, while the complete uncertainty

of the future — worsened by the short-sighted and approximate management of the territory by the victorious powers — made Fiume the anything-but-passive object of manoeuvres implemented from above. This helps to explain the welcome given to D’Annunzio and, at the same time, the fact that local autonomists and irredentists were — especially through the National Council — among the important actors in Fiume with whom the Commander constantly had to deal.

The rest of the reconstruction up to the second post-war period makes it possible to place the authentic passion of Fiume — its true and final sacrifice — not in the Bloody Christmas of 1920 but in the events leading to the final demise of the Italian community, of which D’Annunzio’s intervention was in some ways the prologue. If in the transition from Fiume to Rijeka the continuity of the *urbs* is maintained, as the author puts it, the *civitas* experiences a radical and irreversible caesura.¹³

At the centre of this extensive reconstruction, Pupo offers concise description of the two-year period of 1919-1920, which he simultaneously discusses on the local and national level. This leads him to consider Fiume a “compulsory point of compression” of the radical and polarised politicisation of the post-war period.¹⁴ In his analysis of the Dannunzian period, Pupo gives due consideration to the role of the army, the Commander’s personal cult — celebrated not only by the legionnaires — and the impossibility of making him a mere pawn in the designs of others. The reference to the continuity of certain aspects of the story with the “Radiant May”, not uncommon in existing literature, perhaps underestimates the effects of the war that — in my opinion — seem to clearly distinguish the two events. In turn, the repeated recourse to the concept of “low-intensity civil war” reflects a more precise theme that also emerges in Mondini’s theses discussed further ahead.

What I consider more problematic is the author’s choice of treating separately, in distant paragraphs, the theme of the cultural dimension of “Fiumanism” and that of celebration, an evident stigma whose political significance Pupo does not fail to point out.¹⁵ Such choice may not facilitate the understanding of both aspects and, in particular, their evident intertwining, as Salaris’s work convincingly demonstrates.

In conclusion, a clear judgement of the whole enterprise and its theatrical nature can be traced in a comment on the abandonment of the city after the Bloody Christmas: “[T]he protagonists are saved and the chorus, made up of simple soldiers, legionnaires and citizens, dies.”¹⁶ Another, not necessarily

¹³ Raul Pupo, *Fiume città di passione*, Rome-Bari, Laterza, 2018. The discussion of Fiume as a specific case of the “killing of [twentieth-century] cities” opens the conclusion, starting on p. 284.

¹⁴ R. Pupo, *Fiume città di passione*, cit. p. 90.

¹⁵ R. Pupo, *Fiume città di passione*, cit. p. 108.

¹⁶ Marco Mondini, *Fiume 1919. Una guerra civile italiana*, Salerno, Rome, 2019, cit. p. 146.

opposite, consideration is included in the book's closing pages: the fact that, between 1919 and 1920, Fiume was "one of the possible other places of twentieth-century restlessness [...] becoming a political fact and almost a state [...] in the spotlight of the entire continent".¹⁷ This quote is evidence of both the passion and balance that characterise Pupo's work.

A media invention

The second book that I wish to examine here is *Fiume 1919. Una guerra civile italiana* by Marco Mondini, which builds on a series of theses, as the author explains in the introduction. Fiume is nothing but "a media invention", "a propagandistic stroke of genius",¹⁸ and "a huge misunderstanding",¹⁹ as can be deduced from the way the issue manifests itself. There was no trace of it in Italy, either in the pre-war period or during the war itself: the name of the city never even appeared in the Treaty of London. It was only after the war that Fiume suddenly became the symbol of the mutilated victory, to the extent that it conditioned the entire peace negotiations and gave rise to D'Annunzio's "media masterpiece", "the first example of great national fake news".²⁰ Mondini states that the main aim of his book is to explain how this happened.

A reading of this kind is by no means excessive, as fake news can have serious consequences. Indeed, the Fiume affair was "Pandora's box of post-war Italy",²¹ "the stage for a new civil war: it was only the first act, but few realised it".²² The fact that the civil war and 1919 are mentioned in the title seems to suggest that the author considered these crucial to the whole affair.

Leaving aside catchy and timely expressions,²³ Mondini's theses deserve a few comments at the outset. The strongly propagandistic nature of the Fiume enterprise must at least be combined with two factors that are, in fact, present in the text itself. The first concerns the highly unstable situation in that area in the post-war period, which gave rise — as Pupo well recounts — to tensions and clashes to which the Fiume enterprise in some way responded; the second, on a more general level, lies in the double value that Fiume assumed precisely as a consequence of the war's outcome, not only in symbolic terms. If in the Europe of the Treaty of London its situation may have seemed irrelevant, in the immediate post-war period it quickly became the banner of unrecognised irre-

¹⁷ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 291.

¹⁸ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 8.

¹⁹ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 9.

²⁰ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 12.

²¹ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 12.

²² M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, p. 13.

²³ On the issue of the mutilated victory, see also Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 11: "[I]t cannot be said that the 1919 version of the 'it's all Europe's fault' formula did not work."

dentism, but also a gateway to the Balkan area that had become targetable as a hegemony — an aspect that did not escape the curious attention of France. While the confused and short-sighted mixture of irredentism and imperialism that obstructed the Italian delegation at Versailles beyond measure made it difficult to defend the Treaty of London, at the same time it revealed what appeared to be an unforeseen opportunity, though one consistent with Italian aspirations, thus fuelling the media invention.

As for the idea that Fiume was the “first act” of the subsequent civil war, hence in close continuity with it, viewed from a different perspective one could say that it was the Great War — in Italy as in Europe — that opened Pandora’s box, which had been full at least from the late nineteenth century onwards. It is clearly debatable whether the Fiume affair was a real civil war or rather a peripheral military coup and, at least in the beginning, consistent — albeit in a subversive way — with the still prevalent general approach of the Italian parliament. What is certain is that a civil war of a very different nature would soon strike the heart of the country, partly feeding on the same moods circulating in Fiume but taking on a substantially different character, as Mondini himself observes.

The author’s approach naturally focuses on the genesis and external impact of the enterprise, rather than on the incidents that occurred during D’Annunzio’s 15-month rule over the city, which are somewhat pushed to the background. Above all, what happened in 1920 — after the failure of any compromises and with the downward spiral of “Fiumanism” — remains at the margins and is concentrated in summary evaluations: D’Annunzio’s army is described as “a kind of circus”, the general climate as a “disorderly holiday”,²⁴ whereas the occupants are presented as “a bizarre community of rebels, artists, idealists, idlers and fanatics”.²⁵ It is a fact that, as time went by, the political viability of the enterprise — from a national perspective — appeared to be growing ever weaker, while internal conflicts and contradictions within the peninsula prevailed more clearly over the ideologisation of foreign policy.

Naturally, this does not diminish Fiume’s appeal, sustained from the very beginning by the press and by a widespread consensus in public opinion, although Mondini’s work dedicates less space to these issues than one might expect, despite being based on a broad range of existing scholarship. Yet, even here, the new weight and different quality that the war gave to both of these factors emerge, as does the extreme difficulty of the traditional ruling class to understand the new situation and intervene successfully. In this context, the author considers D’Annunzio’s choice a stroke of media genius, since it concerns a public figure capable of perfectly linking the before and after of the war.

²⁴ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 82.

²⁵ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 11.

However, there is another theme, perhaps less explicit in the book's title and introduction, that is highly interesting and prominent in Mondini's book: the close relationship between the specific event and the overall transformation of the army following the war. Thus, the military leadership acquired an extraordinary power, tenaciously defending it after peace was made, which manifested itself in the establishment of different — and, also for this reason, charged with unprecedented political significance — positions. In this sense, Fiume can be said to be a real litmus test: ranging from Caviglia's traditionally and rigidly loyalist army to Ceccherini's overtly insubordinate one, from Badoglio's tolerant and compromising one to the open support that Admiral Millo — at the head of the army itself — offered to D'Annunzio.

As is well known, this situation was accompanied by the disproportionate growth of the base, fuelled by ever younger recruits with ever less military experience. This phenomenon also had a precise impact on Fiume. In fact, where the greatest contribution to the Ronchi expedition came from Fiume, but not only. As Mondini makes clear, the subsequent constant influx of volunteers continues to be motivated also by the relationship with the conflict that had just ended. People were looking for the continuation of a poorly concluded experience, the completion of a too superficial and fleeting experience or the presumed achievement of something that was only imagined and desired. Consequently, different experiences and motivations created evident asymmetries even among young people of practically the same age, as in the exemplary case of Giovanni Comisso and Guido Keller. The author's analysis ends at this limit, which simultaneously separates and connects the political side and the cultural and existential side of the relationship with the war. This point deserves to be developed further, perhaps in a more detailed study of the situation in Fiume between 1919 and 1920.

I dare, but I scheme

The conspiracy theory that Pupo considers historiographically weak,²⁶ while Mondini calls it a rumour,²⁷ is at the heart of Lucio Villari's *La luna di Fiume. 1919: il complotto*. Here, too, we are dealing with a work that develops various theses, to which the author has added a good dose of controversy.

Villari's discussion revolves around two points. The first is that Fiume was, indeed, the central element of a vast conspiracy — which the press had already denounced at the time, though without obtaining any concrete results — aimed at destroying the liberal state in Italy, with the replacement of Victor Emmanuel III on the throne by the Duke of Aosta and, if necessary, the assassina-

²⁶ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit., pp. 80-81.

²⁷ M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit., p. 63.

tion of Nitti. The second is to affirm, contrary to widespread underestimation, the political value — or rather, disvalue — of the actions of D'Annunzio, who was fully co-responsible for a plan that nevertheless constitutes one of the periodic revivals of a subversive “deep right” that runs through the entire history of united Italy.²⁸ The book also has a particular feature: the second part, which makes up almost half of the volume, contains unpublished documents that, in the author's opinion, substantially reinforce the theses presented in the first part.

Since the aim of Villari's work is to unveil the hidden face of the moon over Fiume, that is, the subversive plot in which it was embedded, the city's appearance in broad daylight (i.e. from September 1919 and throughout 1920) is somehow taken for granted or pushed to the background, as Mondini does for different reasons.

The author is perfectly aware of the circumstantial nature of his reconstruction. Nevertheless, drawing on a wealth of facts and considerations, he confirms that D'Annunzio and Fiume were part of a very wide network of interests, complicity, indulgences, temptations and diverse projects, none of which led to concrete results. What is missing, even if the reader may not feel the pressing need for it, is proof of a precise and coherent plan that rises above this magma. Moreover, such a plan seems very difficult to put together in the acute social and political confusion of the immediate post-war period.

It is evident that D'Annunzio, on his way to Fiume and even before, both dared and schemed, to turn the brilliant formula with which he dismissed the charges of conspiracy upside down. What is more difficult is to imagine the city as a credible base for national subversion. In this regard, Oscar Sinigaglia's account — reproduced in Villari's book — is perhaps even more interesting than certain important events, such as the elections of November 1919 or the marginalisation from Fiume of a conspirator par excellence such as Giovanni Giuriati. In October, even before the events in question happened and the advent of “Fiumanism”, Sinigaglia went to the city to meet the Commander. The observations he wrote in his diary were disheartening: a coming and going of all kinds of people, many of whom spies; a *Comando*, the highest seat of power, where everyone talks too much and about too many things; and the absolute need to purge “boys and madmen” who compromise the image of Fiume and D'Annunzio himself.²⁹ Viewed from this perspective, it is perhaps too much to call the fact that Fiume failed to become a subversive base a mystery.

This in no way disproves the existence of the “deep right” but, as mentioned above, the latter will fully emerge when Fascism, as it progressively emancipated in the post-war period, devoted itself to successfully practising violent acts of subversion under the banner of law and order, and with the complicity of the establishment.

²⁸ Aldo Moro used this expression in a 1977 speech, M. Mondini, *Fiume 1919*, cit. p. 40.

²⁹ Lucio Villari, *La luna di Fiume. 1919: il complotto*, Milan, Guanda, 2019, cit. p. 119.

For Villari, the underestimation of the concrete risk of a coup d'état has gone hand in hand with that of the political D'Annunzio. In fact, a deeply rooted historiographical tradition — whose origins are mainly traced back to De Felice — tends to highlight the literary, aestheticising and narcissistic nature of D'Annunzio's public activity, thus downplaying his political role and responsibility.³⁰ However, the conspiracy theme can perhaps again be put in parentheses. It is clear that, from the pre-war years to 1920, the poet played a leading political role; although he undoubtedly had a narcissistic and aestheticising component, we could argue that the latter — in keeping with the times — actually enhanced the effectiveness of his actions.

It must nonetheless be added that politics was not D'Annunzio's prevailing characteristic if we consider his figure as a whole, and if Fiume represents the culmination of his career, it is at the same time its conclusion. In fact, looking at his actions in the city and his irregular evolution, we can better grasp a limitation of D'Annunzio's political nature: the difficulty in connecting, in a coherent and constant manner, the plan of concrete action — such as the control of social conflicts in the city or the relationship with the various pressure groups — with that of more or less reliable generalist visions, such as the League of Fiume or the Charter of Carnaro. In Villari's opinion, the latter was inconclusive and made “a major concession to ridiculous messages of palingenesis”.³¹

The documentary part of the volume is highly interesting. It consists of various kinds of personal accounts by Oscar Sinigaglia, which are preserved in Guido Jung's private archive in Palermo. The period to which they refer runs from the beginning of April to the beginning of May 1919, when the crisis of the Italian delegation at Versailles reached its peak. The sources reveal how, in parallel with the official negotiations, an equally bitter confrontation unfolded between the Italian delegation and several personalities who were notoriously influential, even at a political level, but without any official capacity: first of all, Sinigaglia himself and Giovanni Giuriati.

The fact that those with public responsibilities unofficially confronted the exponents of a “mobilised” — in Bourdieu's sense — public opinion can be considered a common political practice at the time.³² The fact that this happened in the documented circumstances and terms, though, calls for a different judgement. Orlando and Sonnino were constantly put under pressure by their interlocutors, who essentially dictated the terms at the negotiating table. It was a request that alternated between judgements and reasoning from which, however, a warning constantly emerged: the political tension in

³⁰ L. Villari, *La luna di Fiume*, cit. pp. 126-127.

³¹ L. Villari, *La luna di Fiume*, cit. pp. 46-47.

³² Pierre Bourdieu, *L'opinione pubblica non esiste*, in “Problemi dell'informazione”, n. 1, 1976, cit. pp. 71-88.

the country being very high, it was only by following those indications that there could be any hope of avoiding extremely risky unrest. Even more unexpected and dramatic was the reaction of the interlocutors: Orlando, the head of the government in office, went so far as to offer his resignation — if explicitly requested — to those who were still only private citizens.³³ Sonnino, who during the neutrality was so jealous of his state secrets that he did not even share them with his ministerial colleagues, almost to tears begged Sinigaglia and his people to guarantee him a minimum of tranquillity in Italy so that he could render the country one last service.³⁴

Leaving aside the clash, the two sides evidently agreed on one point: control of the square, which had become a crucial weapon, was in the hands of more or less occult and strong powers, completely eluding the constituted authorities. Is this circumstantial evidence that strongly supports Villari's thesis? Perhaps so, but another consideration is equally important. Beyond the often evoked continuity with the "Radiant May", which also played into Salandra and Sonnino's hands to obtain the legitimisation of a choice that was already formalised by the Treaty of London, the war produced a growth — in both quality and quantity — of public opinion, which made it a politically unavoidable element, while the liberal political class was aware of this but impotent. In essence, Sinigaglia's documents very distinctly confirm Gramsci's judgement, quoted by Villari: "[T]he parliamentary state no longer manages to give a concrete shape to the objective situation of Italy's economic and social life".³⁵

For that matter, a work that presents itself with theses that appear far removed from Mondini's ends up intersecting them. The power of propaganda and the strength of a mobilised public opinion are exactly the necessary instruments to condition the Italian delegation at Versailles and, at the same time, to create a climate in the country that is advantageous to the subversive plan. Hence, on closer reading, Mondini's and Villari's works are complementary, and this enriches their interpretative contribution.

Army and nation

In *Il faro del mondo nuovo*, Enrico Serventi Longhi attempts to analyse the Fiume case taking into account what happened both in the city and outside, for the entire period of the events of 1919 and 1920. Two important conclusions can be drawn from his work: instead of making the common distinction between the 1919 phase and the subsequent phase of the entire 1920s, Serventi

³³ L. Villari, *La luna di Fiume*, pp. 168-169.

³⁴ L. Villari, *La luna di Fiume*, pp. 165-167.

³⁵ L. Villari, *La luna di Fiume*, pp. 109. The quotation was taken from the issue of "Ordine nuovo" of 4 October 1919.

Longhi's periodisation envisages a third distinct period that broadly includes the summer and autumn of the last year. Next, he identifies recurrent ideological and political features that, in a more or less evident manner, affected the entire affair.

The third period is marked by the removal, or at least by the passing into the background, of characters such as Mario Carli and the very author of the Charter of Carnaro, Alceste De Ambris, two protagonists of the — by now concluded — radical and republican “Fiumanism”. D’Annunzio returned to the centre stage without mediations and personally managed what the author calls a “national-socialist twist”: Serventi Longhi draws attention to the rituals of the sacralisation of politics, exalts the theme of sacrificial sublimation that accentuated the mournful component of the famous slogan, “me ne frego” (I don't give a damn), and he accelerates the most extreme ideological aspects as if to rally the soldiers in view of the final test. In this context, the very promulgation of the “holy scriptures” — the Charter of Carnaro and The New Order of the Liberating Army — partly takes on the solemnity of a testamentary message.

It is worth noting that, from a different perspective, this final twist contains concepts and themes that were present ever since the beginning of the Fiume adventure. The basic value throughout the two-year period was that of the nation understood as an organic community, whose functional membership is validated by a corporate institutional structure. The value that the war added to this original entity was that of the armed nation: obviously not the kind that is linked to the democratic tradition of Garibaldi or, it must be said, to the recent reflections of Jaurès.³⁶ The mass conflict simultaneously produced not only a politicisation of the army, but also a militarisation of society, creating a model of nationalisation and power structure that was alternative to that of the liberal tradition. In what was later to be called “the Italy of Vittorio Veneto”, the army and society constantly lived in synergic osmosis, which guaranteed their resilience and strength. The legionnaires are an elitist avant-garde, the sublimation of the shock trooper, no longer a tactical variant to the war of position but an all-round figure of the new man, the result of detailed and specific theoretical and practical training. This personal power, which represents and interprets the unity of the community and guarantees direct communication between the base and the summit, is a further necessary element. The nation in question is obviously not a generic or abstract entity: only the Italian nation — heir and legitimate holder of traditional Latin supremacy, which is both ethnic and cultural — is destined to naturally embody and bear these principles.

It should be stressed that these themes do not arise from the Fiume experience alone. Rather, they reflect moods, discourses and hypotheses that circulated widely during the post-war period, in a no-man's land where even

³⁶ Jean Jaurès, *L'Armée nouvelle*, Paris, Hachette, 2017 (first edition 1911).

opposing radicalisms co-existed. In Fiume, on the other hand, these elements persisted from Giuriati's to De Ambris's Cabinet, up to the third phase highlighted by Serventi Longhi, with different nuances and accents but without ever finding a coherent arrangement.

In this regard, the author's insistence on the substantial weight of D'Annunzio's contribution to the Charter of Carnaro — a suggestive document in its unresolved contamination, and sometimes juxtaposition, between elements stemming from highly different cultures, experiences and sensibilities — is convincing. However, even at the level of practice, we could point to aspects in the Fiume affair that would later characterise an entire strand of twentieth-century politics. Suffice to think of the systematic marginalisation of groups and personalities that had become too intrusive, the accusation of betrayal by those who incautiously tried to criticise positions already endorsed by the Commander, or the need to keep the collective tension constantly high by fuelling consensus with new challenges.

Even such a crucial episode as the end of the *modus vivendi* can be read as the exemplification of a specific idea of power: the will of a representative body, the National Council, is superseded by that expressed directly by the entire community through the referendum, but above individual judgements — which are gathered in this way — is the true feeling of the community body that, expressed by its only recognised interpreter and confirmed by acclamation, annuls any other judgement by virtue of a sort of *fuhrerprinzip* ahead of its time.

The fact that all these aspects stand out in the events of Fiume must be attributed to the uniqueness of this case: a delimited reality whose break with the past is particularly clear, a level of autonomy that was never legitimised but tolerated for a long time and, consequently, a potential to elaborate and experiment with suggestions of various kinds that was much greater than in any other contemporary context.

In what sense, then, can we speak of a “national-socialist twist”, as Serventi Longhi does, particularly with regard to the third phase? The choice of this term is challenging and at the same time ambiguous, if only because it risks reading the Fiume affair through a pre-Nazi lens instead of the — already reductive — pre-Fascist one, as Luciano Zani well observes in his introduction.³⁷ There is too much distance, in every sense of the word, that separates the Fiume case from the National Socialist phenomenon in Germany. The fact remains, as has already been pointed out, that we can randomly trace elements in Fiume that would later be selected, collected and developed in radically different contexts, first by Fascism and then by National Socialism.

³⁷ Luciano Zani, *Introduzione. I “reazionari di sinistra e l'impresa fiumana*, in Enrico Serventi Longhi, *Il faro del mondo nuovo. D'Annunzio e i legionari a Fiume tra guerra e rivoluzione*, Udine, Gaspari, 2019 pp. 9-18.

Another risk concerns the fact that the many different aspects of the case are all read and treated in the same way regardless of their concrete impact. The Charter of Carnaro and the revolutionary ordering of the army remain — and will always remain — no more than a theory, the League of Fiume was experimented with for a few months, whereas people like Giuriati or De Ambris had a similar time frame to make their mark. In other words, Fiume lacked the time, and perhaps the opportunity, to try out and develop suggestions, hypotheses and theories, let alone to link them to the preconditions of a possible future regime. This is also why it seems appropriate to place the case in the immediate post-war period, which — not only in Italy — we can reasonably consider to have ended by the mid-1920s.

Art and life

As I have already mentioned, *Alla festa della rivoluzione* by Claudia Salaris has an important historiographical merit. With regard to the most conspicuous aspects of the Fiume affair, namely those that — at the time, but not only — made it the site of an Edenic utopia or a perverse dystopia, this work has overcome two tendencies that are equally unproductive in terms of knowledge production. The easiest and most popular trend reduces the whole affair to its picturesque and transgressive aspects, in line with a not necessarily truthful, scandalising reading that already existed at the time; the opposite tendency dismisses those aspects as substantially irrelevant with respect to the political and ideological components of the event.³⁸

Building also on her specific expertise, Salaris bases her analysis on literature, Comisso in the first instance; futurism, used as theory and practice, mainly *La Testa di Ferro* and its founder Mario Carli; the confused but significant cultural arsenal manifested in the “Yoga” association; and many more. From here she moved on to the ceremonial and existential level of celebration, understood in the broadest sense, and to that of more specific and diverse activities such as subsistence and robbery economy.

Salaris’s representation of Fiume certainly does not lack local colour: sexual freedom and transgression, the widespread use of drugs, the absurd as a way of life, and the collective celebration of unrestrained excitement. Yet, the whole is read from an anthropological perspective and with theoretical references that give even these phenomena a significant analytical depth. This derives not so much from specific references than from the possibility of inserting a seem-

³⁸ For more information on the preparation behind Salaris’s work see the more recent publication by Simonetta Bartolini, “Yoga”. *Sovversivi e rivoluzionari con D’Annunzio a Fiume*, Milan, Luni, 2019, which furthermore reproduces the texts of the association’s weekly organ in full.

ingly anecdotal dimension into a continuum that evokes topics of guaranteed importance and different extent.

The biggest hotheads in Fiume were thinking of reviving a traditional festival, the “love castle”, to drive away D’Annunzio’s lover of the moment whose influence was unwelcome — yet another paradox of a project that never evolved into anything concrete but was no less known and debated for it. However, more lies beyond the quaintness of a fantasy that never happened: the clash between groups to condition the Commander, a female character judged politically cumbersome, the recourse to tradition as a political tool and other possible readings.

This type of approach is enriched, as I have mentioned above, by theoretical references that constantly support the proposed interpretation. In this way, Salaris contributes to valorising a material that is usually used in a wrong way, if at all, even if her reading occasionally seems to be a stretch. It is a fact that the way in which the isolated city was provided for went beyond the merely economic dimension. On the one hand, there was the demonstrative dimension of adventure and challenge; on the other, a network of important relationships was activated through fundraising, the mediation of Senator Borletti and the direct involvement of maritime union leader Beppe Giulietti. Far less convincing is the idea that the repeated seizure of ships and their cargoes — the “pirate economy” in Salaris’s words — could be considered an alternative economic model that questioned the gift theory and non-mercantile reciprocity, including D’Annunzio’s speeches from the government palace.

But the more general interpretative key that Salaris uses is that of Hakim Bey’s TAZ.³⁹ From this perspective, Fiume was temporarily an autonomous zone; escaping the usual social and institutional constraints, it enjoyed an extraordinary degree of freedom that, in a kind of suspension of time, can only be concentrated and exhausted in the present. However, since the temporary autonomous zones constitute a historically recurrent phenomenon, it becomes possible to connect the Fiume affair — in a no longer impressionistic manner — to a series of other cases that, starting naturally from the protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s, can extend as far as the cyberpunk scene, in one sense, and the ancient pirate communities, in the other.

In the field of history, it is never a question of evaluating a theory as such, but rather of weighing its usefulness to the interpretation of a concrete case. Think, for example, not of the similarities but the differences between 1968 and the Fiume case, or even just those between the role of the economic boom — and of almost a quarter of a century of peace — and that of economies and societies distorted by a war whose end is hard to accept. The reduced heuristic force of the juxtaposition seems evident to me.

³⁹ Hakim Bey, *TAZ. Zone temporaneamente autonome*, Milan, Shake edizioni underground, 1998 (first edition 1985).

Once again it is difficult to overestimate the weight of the Great War in the whole Fiume affair. To evaluate it also in relation to the phenomena that most interest Salaris, it would be useful to pick up the soldiers' experience, as in Leed's classic analysis, to seek its mirror reflection in the Fiume case.⁴⁰ The devastated territory of the trenches and the no-man's land is juxtaposed with the rediscovery of nature, with hikes in the woods and nocturnal gatherings illuminated by torchlight. Technique as an anonymous and ruthless power turns into naval and airborne means of individual "exploits". The motionless anonymity of the infantryman is opposed by the individual or collective legionary protagonism of the raids, the hand-to-hand attacks and the adventurous mockery. The invisible and unspeakable war is succeeded by a military activity whose first purpose is to be shown and communicated as widely as possible. Finally, the irreconcilable rift between the soldier and civil society simply does not exist: legionnaires and Fiuman citizens co-exist in close contact, and the festive dimension enhances their cohesion. It even seems as if the idea of war that animated the enthusiasm of the "comunità d'agosto" in 1914 is reproduced here in an almost virtual manner. Not just a "Caporetto in reverse", according to the famous declaration, but the reverse side of the entire Great War. The fascination with Fiume, the atmosphere that animates it along with the ever-lurking risk of constant monotony due to the long wait, perhaps owes much to this aspect and the almost unconscious feeling of its illusory character.

The Commander

The last publication that I want to discuss here is Giordano Bruno Guerri's *Disobbedisco*, which distinguishes itself from the works examined so far for several reasons. The first two important elements are the sheer size of the volume — over five hundred pages enriched by a selection of images — and the fact that it is clearly conceived and constructed for a broad audience. These two aspects give the volume a strongly episodic structure in which the overall picture emerges from the sum of various — known and unknown — events and personalities, which have been collected in a text that is captivating in both form and substance. It must be added, though, that we are dealing with the work of a specialist, based largely on first-hand sources and which touches on usually neglected aspects of the Fiume affair thanks to close observation. Among other things, the author's extensive use of the Vittoriale Archives allows a glimpse, albeit an occasional one, of the city's everyday social life, which is usually overlooked.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Eric J. Leed, *Terra di Nessuno. Esperienza bellica e identità personale nella Prima guerra mondiale*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1985 (first edition 1979).

⁴¹ Giordano Bruno Guerri, *Disobbedisco. Cinquecento giorni di rivoluzione. Fiume 2019-2020*, Milan, Mondadori, 2019, cit. chapter X.

Gabriele D'Annunzio is consistently at the centre of the work, also functioning as a point of convergence of many different suggestions. Guerri certainly does not approach the "prophet" with merciless or accusing tones, as do Pupo and Villari respectively, but he carefully avoids gratuitous apologies and instead restores the character's contradictions. In particular, the author goes to great lengths to emphasise the Commander's distance from Fascism, especially from Mussolini. If, however, it is clear that — beyond their mutual intolerance — the two come out of the nineteenth-century matrix on contrasting trajectories, all the extenuating circumstances regarding the poet's subsequent relations with Fascism that the author raises in the epilogue do not hide the evidence of a reciprocal and conscious instrumentalisation.

Guerri offers a far more effective reading, thanks also to the meticulous reconstructions, of the Commander's role in the Fiume affair. It is clear that the decision to entrust D'Annunzio with the leadership of the expedition was decisive for its success: Ronchi's march soon turned out to be a military parade that the regular army did not hinder but actually accompanied, and the "storming" of the city was a plebiscitary investiture, without any real objections even from the allied forces. The constituted authorities were aware of the excessive risk of an open confrontation with D'Annunzio, who had added to his pre-war prestige, power and popularity the image of the adventurous and heroic fighter. Fiume remained in its turbulent limbo up to 15 months and came out of it not because of an internal collapse, on which the Italian State had set its hopes until the end, but only thanks to military intervention, the result of which was also quickly muted.

The way the final crisis developed poses a different problem: that of the endurance — among so many objective difficulties — of D'Annunzio's power in the city. This is by no means an absolute and monolithic personal power, and Guerri's text shows this well, thanks also to its wealth of anecdotes. The Commander's actions constantly unfold in a web of relations with actors such as the National Council, the trade unions or the political cabinet, and other actors that are less structured and of a highly varied nature: autonomists and irredentists, monarchists, republicans and Bolshevik Russian sympathisers, career soldiers, police officers, volunteers, cumbersome lovers and close associates, all difficult to keep in check. They all try to push the unquestioned leader to their side, to condition him with initiatives taken independently and to somehow cast their rivals in a negative light. What all these players have in common is the more or less conscious certainty that to question D'Annunzio's authority would mean the end of Fiume; his function, if not that of a tyrant or arbiter, is therefore irreplaceable.

One of the tools that can guarantee this position is undoubtedly his extraordinary ability to bear an aesthetics of politics that, unlike the secular phenom-

enon Mosse studied in Germany,⁴² is constantly modelled in a short time and different forms. Fiume is the beacon of the world because its sacrifice testified to the nobility of the ideals that it nurtures, but also because people such as Toscanini and Marconi went there to parade even at the end of 1920. The sublimation, in the rhetoric of the *beau geste*, of the kidnapping of a general or Guido Keller's aerial provocations over Rome is juxtaposed with the mysticism of the last association added to the Charter of Carnaro that "has no art nor nobility nor vocabulary" and refers to the symbol of the burning lamp, the promise of an "effort without effort".⁴³ On the more everyday level of the mobilising effectiveness of outbursts whose content is often difficult to decipher, we seamlessly move to the legionnaire — but not only — "prophet", who hikes in nature, eats communal meals in the open air and poses in group photos with his favourite dog at his side.

In addition, the Commander exerts his extraordinary inventiveness in an equally improvised invention of tradition, which can combine the civic glories of modern Italy with the exploits of Dalmatian pirates and — on the most diverse occasions — coin Latin mottos and nicknames, honours and decorations. It is a convulsive practice that contributes both to constantly motivating a suspended community and to promoting nearly all its activities — for itself as for its observers. In a different vein, the suppleness and timing of D'Annunzio's aesthetics of politics and invention of tradition, if we may call them such, are instead presented in a "prêt-à-porter" version of a visibly twentieth-century nature.

The idea that everything in Fiume takes place also in the prospect of being instantly enjoyed is certainly part of both D'Annunzio's highly modern inventiveness and the attraction that the city exerts on those who observe it and those who inhabit it. However, in the notebooks in which the Commander described the events, and which Guerri extensively quotes, he often shifts from being a protagonist to becoming a spectator, absorbed in the — already completed — spectacular narration of events. After his unprecedented experience as a mediator in a trade union negotiation, what strikes him is the workers' enthusiastic astonishment at the eloquence with which he voices their reasons.⁴⁴ On other occasions, his account of what happened is composed of shreds of images, similar to the notes for an expressionist film: "The atrocious song — the excitement — the walk in the old town. The weeping women"; "The ardour. The intoxication of the song. The aura of the *soviet*. The intoxication of freedom. The passion of women."⁴⁵

⁴² George Mosse, *La nazionalizzazione delle masse*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1975 (first edition 1974).

⁴³ G.B. Guerri, *Disobbedisco*, cit., pp. 321-323.

⁴⁴ G.B. Guerri, *Disobbedisco*, cit. pp. 238-239.

⁴⁵ G.B. Guerri, *Disobbedisco*, cit. p. 149, p. 152.

If it is true, as De Felice wrote, that D'Annunzio was capable — more than anyone else — of coinciding with “new realities, new problems, new moods, new human and social and, therefore, political solutions that were as disoriented as ever, but which were common to vast sectors of the former fighters and petit-bourgeois youth”,⁴⁶ then Fiume is certainly the ideal place for this ability to fully manifest itself without having — as Guerri aptly illustrates — a possible sequel.

Conclusion

If we were to identify a distinguishing feature that all examined publications share, we could say that it lies in the choice of pursuing specific themes regarding Fiume, perhaps in the knowledge that this would be the best way to further clarify the overall situation. Viewed from this perspective, unexpected relationships may emerge. Salaris and Pupo, for example, each stress in different ways how important it is to make the city (and what happens there) an object of study to avoid superficial analyses. In this sense, the relevance of diachrony or lived experience somewhat refers to Reill's direct approach, in a field also touched upon — albeit episodically — by Guerri, as I have mentioned above. Mondini's and Serventi Longhi's works highlight the need to closely examine the qualitative and quantitative transformations that took place in the army as a result of the war, and which clearly had an impact on Fiume. Mondini and Villari document — differently yet in a complementary way — the central role of propaganda, directly proportional to the role of public opinion. It then becomes easier to assess what, despite appearances, was from the beginning a matter of domestic rather than foreign policy in the Italian history of the Fiume experience. Finally, Guerri's “Dannunzian” reading, if compared to the other interpretations, contributes to placing the Commander's action in a network of bonds that overturns the one-man-in-charge image.

Fiume is clearly still fertile ground for historians, and a glance at recent approaches gives an idea of topics that remain to be explored. For instance, the variety and importance of female protagonism — from the political to the social field,⁴⁷ from educational to voluntary and militant engagement — calls for an analysis from a gender perspective that clears the theme from the worst stereotypes, which are reductive as well as predictable. Inevitably, there is also an extraordinary amount of iconographic material that has thus far only been

⁴⁶ Quoted in L. Villari, *La luna*, cit., p. 127.

⁴⁷ Several insights in this regard, but also concerning inter-ethnic relations, can be found in Francesca Rolandi, *Un trionfo mai richiesto? Partecipazione politica femminile e rappresentazioni di genere nella stampa locale di Fiume e Susak dopo la grande guerra*, in “Italia contemporanea”, n.293, August 2020, cit. pp. 73-98.

examined in an occasional and fragmentary manner. A rigorous approach in terms of visual history — or, if one prefers, visual culture — would finally give the right depth of interpretation to one of the most significant and redundant sources related to the Fiume experience that we can rely on.⁴⁸ It is precisely from works like Reill's that we understand how much remains to be said about the life and attitudes of the population during that period and, within this framework, about the dynamics of inter-ethnic relations.⁴⁹

To conclude, the comparative reading of even very dissimilar works cannot but lead one to reflect on their hidden thematic and problematic interconnections, so that the reading of each sheds more light on the results of the others, and vice versa. If the reference to the limits of strictly mono-thematic approaches even in the sphere of consolidated specialisations may seem obvious or generic, we could argue that the strong territorial and temporal concentration of the Fiume case — together with its originality, despite being exemplary of the European post-war period — makes that reference particularly relevant for future interpretations.

⁴⁸ A thematic organisation based on a rich selection of images is offered in M. Franzinelli and P. Cavassini, *Fiume.*, op. cit. Exemplary in this field is the recent work by Gabriele D'Autilia, *La guerra cieca. Esperienze ottiche e culture visuali nella grande guerra*, Milan, Meltemi, 2018.

⁴⁹ For a recent publication on this topic, see Tea Perincic, *Rijeka or death! D'Annunzio's occupation of Rijeka, 1919-1921*, Rijeka, Naklada Val, 2019.