

Italian Art circa 1968: Continuities and Generational Shifts¹

Adrian R. Duran

Memphis College of Art

Nineteen sixty-eight has long been heralded as a, if not *the*, pivotal moment of the post-World War II decades. Following the assassinations of Malcolm X and both Kennedys, the erection of the Berlin Wall, the war in Vietnam, the first manned space flights, the Second Vatican Council and the invasion of technology throughout Europe, that single year was perhaps the most powerful and tectonic paradigm shift of the many that the decade already had witnessed. The student uprisings in Paris, the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the invasion of Prague by Warsaw Pact troops all exacerbated what had been a markedly violent period, quelling the optimism that had marked much of the decade and setting the tone for the coming malaise of the 1970s.

Italy, too, was participant in these epochal events, albeit in a somewhat different manner. Its students' uprisings began slightly earlier than those of France; the occupation of the University of Trento took place in the autumn of 1967. These were followed by workers' protests, with massive strikes in the first half of the year. However, the national elections of 1968 diverted much attention, and uniquely peculiar events, including the June 10th European Championship victory over Yugoslavia (2-0) and the declaration of the Republic of Rose Island off of the coast of Rimini, made for a varied experience.

Artistically, 1968 saw Italy peering across new, unexplored terrain. Over the course of the previous few years, a group of exhibitions throughout the country began introducing those who would soon be known as *arte povera*.² The nomenclature itself was debuted at the September 1967 "Arte povera – Im spazio" exhibition held at Genoa's La Bertesca gallery, though its protagonists held noteworthy shows at Turin's Sperone gallery and Rome's L'Attico in the years preceding. These were followed by exhibitions in Turin, Bologna, Amalfi, the Castelli

Warehouse in New York, and at Harald Szeeman's "Live in Your Head: When Attitudes Become Form" at the Kunsthalle, Bern. Championed by critic Germano Celant, *arte povera* represented Italy's first movement of truly significant international import since the prewar era.³

The rapid rise of *arte povera* and its formidable presence on the international stage, however, should not give the impression of a Minerva-like group springing fully formed from the critical mind of Celant. Rather; their footing had been cleared by a number of groups and individual artists of an earlier generation. This is not to detract from the radical innovations brought about by each of the participants in *arte povera*, but is instead to understand fully the intense and sustained development of the immediate postwar period. The two and a half decades that preceded the emergence of *arte povera* brought about a series of accomplishments that, collectively, opened up the availability of those tactics utilized by *arte povera* in their own breakthroughs, breakthroughs that finally severed the bindings of Italian art to High Modernism.

This paper will return to those decades immediately following Italy's liberation and trace the development of the visual arts during these years, situating 1968 and the concurrent emergence of *arte povera* as a critical pivot in the history of Italian art after World War II. That fateful year is to be understood as the moment in which the foci and contexts of the postwar generation give way to those of their successors, ushering in what would become Italian postmodernism. This is not meant to be a comprehensive history of that period. Certain points are emphasized for coherence as well as to draw attention to significant developments that carry throughout. Neither is this to imply or impose a teleological history of Italian art. The history established in this paper is neither linear nor preordained, but instead an aggregate of singular advances that made possible the vocabularies and strategies employed by *arte povera*.

Almost immediately following the cessation of hostilities, a new generation of artists, nurtured by the anti-Fascist Resistance, emerged. Their work was directly responsive to the events of the war, perhaps best illustrated by two portfolios of images taken from the Resistance: Renato Birolli's *Italia '44* and Renato Guttuso's *Gott mit uns*. Both Birolli and Guttuso were affiliated with the Milanese group *Corrente*, which had been targeted by Mussolini himself.⁴ In October of 1946, they, along with nine of their Milanese, Venetian and Roman compatriots, launched the *Fronte Nuovo delle Arti*.⁵ The agenda of the *Fronte Nuovo* was the revitalization of the Italian avant-garde, which was

accomplished with some measurable success, following its inaugural exhibition at the Galleria della Spiga in Milan in June of 1947 and the 1948 Venice Biennale.

If the *Fronte Nuovo* can be characterized by any single trait, it would be its heterogeneity. The post-Cubism of Birolli and Guttuso, Vedova and Pizzinato's Futurist-inflected dynamics, Turcato's non-objective abstractions, and Leoncillo's angular ceramics were all welcomed into the group's project, along with the works of painters Antonio Corpora, Giuseppe Santomaso, and Emilio Morlotti and sculptors Pericle Fazzini and Alberto Viani. This multiplicity of idiom was due, in part, to this generation being the first exposed to the full breadth of prewar Modernism through events such as the Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Moderna's 1946 *Pittura Francese d'oggi* and the retrospective exhibitions at the 1948 Biennale and reports brought back by artists and critics abroad. Their coming together was bound to an anti-Facist, pro-Modernist rejuvenation, that is, an ideological grouping, not one contoured by a single unifying style.

This heterogeneity, however, proved to be the group's undoing. In November 1948, on the occasion of the *Prima mostra nazionale d'Arte contemporanea* in Bologna, Palmiro Togliatti, head of the Partito Comunista Italiano, launched an attack against abstraction, calling for all artist members of the PCI to abandon what he called "cose mostruose" and "scarabocchi."⁶ Almost immediately, the discourse formed itself into a Gordian knot of agenda-driven logic, Cold War politics, and personal understandings of what art should be and do. The most immediate effect was the dissolution of the *Fronte Nuovo*. Those who both held membership to the PCI and painted with an abstract vocabulary were made to choose one over the other. Some chose the PCI, others chose abstraction, and the *Fronte Nuovo* was a memory by the early months of 1950. What is remarkably dissonant about the entire circumstance is the divergence of criticism from practice. Togliatti's prescriptions and the discourse they engendered situated realism and abstraction as antitheses, reflective of the larger binaries of the time, both Cold War (Communists vs. Christian Democrats, East vs. West, etc.) and High Modernist (avant-garde vs. kitsch, representation vs. abstraction, etc.).

The work produced by the *Fronte Nuovo*, however, belies an entirely different set of criteria. Realism and abstraction are permeable categories, intermingled quantities that shuttle and oscillate within each work. None of their works can be categorized as strictly one or the other.

Rather than an either/or construction, the late-1940s production of the members of the *Fronte Nuovo* demonstrates a different paradigm, that of both/neither, wherein those classifications by which the discourse seeks to quantify the works are rendered insufficient and needlessly antagonistic. This problematizing of taxonomies was the great achievement of the *Fronte Nuovo* and, though it was ultimately unsustainable within the artistic-political context of early Cold War Italy, it offered a new openness to artistic methods and vocabularies.

The *Fronte Nuovo* was not the only group struggling to overcome the limitations of political and artist categories. In March of 1947, the Roman group *Forma* published its manifesto, proclaiming,

“We declare ourselves to be FORMALISTS and MARXISTS, convinced that the terms Marxism and formalism are not IRRECONCILABLE, especially now that the progressive elements in our society must hold a REVOLUTIONARY AND AVANTGARDE position.”⁷⁷

Their platform was built on a reaction against the historicism and empty expressionism of the Novecento group, quite reasonable to expect of a generation that had been excluded by the Fascist artistic apparatus, many of whom had participated in Resistance activities.

Their desire to reconcile what had been considered irreconcilable reflects the larger efforts of this generation to dissolve hierarchies and categories, and their work, like that of the *Fronte Nuovo*, reflects a multiplicity of means. Carla Accardi’s abstractions of the late-1940s are lyrical, with reminiscences of objectivity, as are Ugo Attardi’s, which are often based upon landscapes. Antonio Sanfilippo’s is a much less referential abstraction, built with patches of color of varying formal rigor, and Giulio Turcato, who was also exhibiting with the *Fronte Nuovo*, had achieved the greatest distance from representation.

Forma, like the *Fronte Nuovo*, would also fracture by decade’s end. Theirs, however, was an internal dissolution, with individual artistic agendas diverging and personal matters—Piero Dorazio’s leaving for America, Achille Perilli’s military service, and the death of sometime member Concetto Maugeri—intervening. It was significantly less abrupt, artificial, and externally induced than that of the *Fronte Nuovo*. Nonetheless, and despite the differences of location, aesthetics, and political agendas, both of these groups had a forceful impact on Italian

art immediately after World War II, moving it beyond the torpor and isolation of the Fascist period and laying the groundwork for the developments of the following decades.

Concurrent with the *Fronte Nuovo delle Arti* and *Forma*, Lucio Fontana's Spatialism appeared as another important trajectory in the development of Italian postwar art, one that significantly broadened both the concerns and tactics of this period. Already by 1948, Fontana was calling for an elaboration of painting and sculpture beyond their formulas and boundaries.⁸ This notion had led him to embrace installation, evidenced in his *Ambiente spaziale a luce nera* at Milan's Galleria del Naviglio and his later work of the early-1950s at the IX Triennale di Milano, 1951, and the XXXI Fiera di Milano, 1953. These works moved his practice beyond the painted plane into neon tubing and punctured ceiling panels, the antecedents of his widely known *bucchi* and *tagli*. Noteworthy as some of the earliest installation work in postwar Italy, these also maintained two points of focus that would prove lasting and durable into later decades: an embracing of industrial and mechanical technology and a persistent questioning of the necessity of the structural integrity of the art object. Holes, shafts, and the illusory solidity of light became Fontana's materials, entering into the discourse a radically de-centered notion of the materiality and behavior of painting.

The Spatialist project was, at its most successful, a prescient break from the normative practices of painting. By decade's end, Fontana was joined by others, all of whom enacted their own breaking through the boundaries of the medium. Consistent among these was a turn to the sculptural, whether through an actual manipulation of the painted support, or through a hybridization of painting with an external process or material. Perhaps best known among these are Piero Manzoni's *Achromes*. The clear differences with Fontana's practice notwithstanding, Manzoni similarly modulates painting towards "the material heterogeneity rendered inert in modernist painting."⁹ Simultaneously, others, including Agostino Bonalumi¹⁰ and Emilio Vedova¹¹ were breaking into three-dimensionality.

Of some importance in considering this quartet of artists are their differences of age. Fontana and Vedova are of an earlier generation. Though born twenty years apart (1899 and 1919, respectively) both artists came to their earliest maturity in the years immediately after World War II. Manzoni and Bonalumi were significantly younger (born 1933 and 1935) and their emergence reflects an overlapping of generations that would move Italian art away from the primary thrusts of late-1940s

and early-1950s into the more open and aggressively experimental late-1950s and early-1960. This transition is of fundamental importance as it synthesized the innovations of the earlier period, amplifying their prominence, and incubating the ideals and strategies that would prove central to *arte povera* and the generation of 1968.

Bonalumi's work at the end of the 1950s is not entirely unlike Manzoni's. Canvases are punctured by wood and cement, as if growing out from within the weave of the canvas. They are alternately organic and otherworldly, dry and viscous, tactile in attraction and optical in revulsion, like Manzoni's sagging kaolin and ossified breads or Burri's burnt plastics



Agostino Bonalumi "Blu" 1967. Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Moderna, Rome.

and distressed sacks. These were followed, in the first years of the 1960s, by monochrome canvases with slight, bulbous protuberances, organized in regular grid patterns and others with rhythmic undulations and pinches that remind one of furniture upholstery. Bonalumi's constructions maintain the sovereignty of the hanging, rectilinear support, but their sculptural skeletons and rolling, bulging surfaces exist in a dialogue beyond painting, close to the sculptural but adequately described by neither.

Similar, both in development and date, are the works of Emilio Vedova. A tangential affiliate of *Corrente* and a founding member of the *Fronte Nuovo delle Arti*, Vedova had been at the center of the Togliatti-induced chaos of the late-40s, ultimately choosing his own direction over that of the party, emerging as one of Italy's foremost practitioners of *informel*. At the dawn of the 1960s his career underwent a substantive change of direction, largely the result of a collaboration with composer Luigi Nono on the opera *Intolleranza 1960*.¹² Premiered on April 13, 1961 at that year's International Festival of Contemporary Music sponsored by the Biennale di Venezia, *Intolleranza 1960* prompted Vedova's first explorations of the intersection of physical space and the painted surface. His scenography for Nono's *Intolleranza 1960* included mobile spheres, suspended geometric screens, portable screens carried by the actors, and tracked platforms onto which Vedova projected painted and manipulated slides and films. Newly present in this scenographic work is the inclusion of direct references to contemporary Europe, derived from Angelo Ripellino's libretto.¹³

This integration of pointed text references also infiltrated Vedova's contemporaneous *Reliefs*, which marry a slashing brushwork with contemporary tragedy—Franco's Spain, the Kennedy assassination, and Cold War Berlin. Most importantly, the *Reliefs* of the early-1960s, though still bound to the limitations of the flat, quadrilateral support, mark Vedova's break into three-dimensional construction.

The advancements and developments evident in *Intolleranza 1960* and the *Reliefs* reached their full maturity in the creation of the *Absurdes Berliner Tagebuch*, executed in Berlin between 1963 and 1965. Created during Vedova's tenure as artist in residence at the Senate for Science and Art, the *Absurdes Berliner Tagebuch* is a suite of three-dimensional constructions called *plurimi* (Italian: multiples). Constructed of broken, slashed, and charred pieces of wood, bolted and lashed together with rope and wire salvaged from the embankments of the Spree, Spandau, and around Karl-Marx-Straße, the *plurimi* are opened up on the floor,



Emilio Vedova "Absurdes Berliner Tagebuch" 1963-65. Berlinische Galerie, Berlin.

propped against walls, and suspended from the ceiling. Viewers are invited to manipulate the *plurimi*, enacting the multiplicity from which they take their name. Their surfaces are encrusted with paint, pierced, and plastered with collaged print media, and often interspersed with recognizable glyphs. They carry the scars of war—the militaristic decrepitude and discontinuity of Berlin itself. The *Absurdes Berliner Tagebuch*, like the city, consists of an accumulation of battered remains—a rickety grouping of structures no longer whole, but not entirely destroyed.

Though perhaps not an intuitive pairing, Vedova's production during these years bears a certain kinship to that of Manzoni who was simultaneously enacting his own radical departures from the limitations of High Modernism. First, both left behind the limitations of the flat, quadrilateral support in favor of a mobile, dimensional practice that embraced both temporality and the body of the viewer. Ducking through a room full of Vedova's *plurimi* or moving their hinged wings into new positions are significantly different uses of the body than Manzoni's transformative signing of the viewer into sculpture or the placing of oneself on *Magic Base*. Nonetheless, each of these interactions engages corporeality far more immediately than had thus far been attempted in Italian postwar

art, moving the focus beyond an interrogation of the material existence of the work into a meditation on the situationality of the work of art, its variability in both time and space and the role of the viewing body in its completion or finality. This mobility of medium, form and existence would prove one of the cornerstones of later endeavors.

The fugitive, ironically, may have been the most consistent variable in Manzoni's career, and was most evident in his later works, which offer a set of breakthroughs central to the developments in art of the later 1960s. Foremost amongst the fugitive in Manzoni's production is the object itself. Broken eggs, marker washed off of the body, and deflated balloons of the artist's breath all speak to the insistence upon degradation embedded in these works. The work is often organic or, at times, takes on the behaviors of an organism. Bound to this is the centrality of temporality. Each work exists as such for a finite period of time and, though a certain residue remains, each will inevitably dissipate. Furthermore, Manzoni's works all prompt a questioning of the credibility of the artist, particularly in relation to the accessibility of any evidence of the physical existence of the work. It is his given and perceived credibility that transforms eggs and bodies into works of art, imbues a wooden base with powers to do the same, and allows the whole of the Earth to be absorbed as a single sculptural object placed unwittingly upon its own base. Moreover, it is this credibility—and the attached certificate declaring authenticity, a concept which itself becomes remarkably slippery—that convinces the viewer that the length of line contained within a canister is as described and that tins of feces are worth their weight in gold. The debt to Duchamp notwithstanding, Manzoni's may have been the most revolutionary practice to that point, if not at all, in postwar Italy. His death in 1961 abbreviated what may have been a long career, but his breakthroughs, along with those of his contemporaries, opened the terrain for the navigations that would emerge with *arte povera*.

The beginnings of *arte povera* in the middle/late-1960s marked a tectonic shift in the landscape of Italian art. The map of Italian postwar art was reoriented, with Turin and Genoa rising in importance and Rome being reinforced as a center of indisputable importance. Though not unprecedented—one could quickly cite F.T. Marinetti's role in Futurism or Lionello Venturi's actions with *Il Gruppo degli Otto*—the emergence of Germano Celant as its critic-advocate signaled a new discursive voice, removed in location, ideals, and age from the previous generation of critics that had dominated Italian art since the war. Critics

and curators such as Venturi, Rodolfo Pallucchini, Giuseppe Marchiori, Marco Valsecchi, and Mario De Micheli, who were largely responsible for the rejuvenation of the Italian art world after the demise of Fascism, were rendered somewhat of an old guard, concerned with issues and politics of a previous moment. Celant's 1967 essay "Arte Povera: Notes for a Guerrilla War"¹⁴ adopted the language of the day, bonding the group with the anti-Capitalist, anti-imperialist Marxism of the student movements that were coalescing throughout Europe. He claimed a focus on

contingency, events, ahistoricism, the present...an anthropological outlook, 'real man'...and the hope (now a certainty of discarding all visually univocal and coherent discourse...¹⁵

Given the climate of 1968, it is not unnatural for one to see these pronouncements as the dawning of a new consciousness. And, when paired with the works of these young artists, this moment certainly would appear to be the onset of something entirely new and different.

It is critical, however, to reassert the developments of the previous decades when assessing the novelty of *arte povera*. By no means is this to diminish its innovations, which were substantive in light of these same previous decades, but instead to recalibrate our understanding of what these final years of the 1960s meant within a larger temporal span. As one comes to understand the totality of *arte povera* it is unavoidable to recognize the incubation of many of its tactics in earlier projects. The pronounced politicism of Luciano Fabbro's suspended Italian peninsulae, Michelangelo Pistoletto's painted protests, Mario Merz's igloos, and Pino Pascali's fictive armaments all engage the global political circumstance in ways similar to Vedova's, Nono's, and those of an entire generation weaned on the anti-Fascist sentiments of the Resistance. Furthermore, the actual or potential changeability of Giovanni Anselmo's sculptures, which eat salad, absorb atmospheric moisture, and struggle against the energies of torsion, and the works of Pier Paolo Calzolari, Gilberto Zorio, and Jannis Kounellis, all of which harness and activate chemical and physical phenomena, bear some debt to Manzoni's fugitive and organic work at the beginning of the decade. Installation, a favored tactic of Kounellis and Pistoletto, also has its roots in earlier work, particularly during the moments in which the viewer becomes an activator of or participant in the work.

Of course, one cannot simply homogenize the circumstances and claim that one begets the other, that the generation of 1968 simply borrowed and adapted the tactics of their predecessors, shuttling them into their own particular moment. The difference of ideological circumstance is sufficient to explode this possibility. World War II had ceased to be dominant in the political maturation of these artists, giving way to the war in Vietnam and the much opened social discourses of the period. The late-1960s were an intellectual landscape dominated by the new ideas of Eco, Lippard, and the Frankfurt School, much apart from those of Togliatti and Marshall Plan Europe.

Methodologically, this brief, albeit monumental, moment of 1968 has always found itself positioned as the point of departure from which postmodernism emerged in Italian art. This is certainly a credible and demonstrable argument. As such, however, what is often lost is the way in which historical periods are not marked by explicit beginnings and endings, but rather fade into and out of one another, depositing sediment upon which new foundations are laid. Departures, particularly in the history of art, are rarely sudden and unforeseen. Their identification is often retrospective, and this backward looking reveals not only what new has emerged, but also how that which is at one point fully formed is at a previous point embryonic and developmental. With this awareness, it does us well to consider 1968 as not simply the moment at which Italian art of the previous decades is overtaken, but also the moment at which its seeds finally blossom and begin to germinate.

Notes

1. The ideas in this paper are the result of a number of conversations, discussions, and collaborations with many exciting and wonderfully supportive scholars and colleagues. Foremost among these are Ann Gibson, Lara Pucci, Angela Dalle Vacche, Carol Nigro, Jennifer Hirsh, Lindsay Harris, and Stephanie Pilat. Their expertise has been of great benefit to this work.

2. Currently, the most accessible and thorough resource on *arte povera* is Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev, ed., *Arte povera*. London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1999.

3. By the 1950s, Italian art had attained some notice on an international scale. The Museum of Modern Art's 1949 exhibition "Twentieth Century Italian Art" did much to expose American audiences to Italian Modernism, as

did Catherine Viviano's gallery in New York City. Lionello Venturi's *Gruppo degli Otto* also held shows throughout Europe. For information on the group, see Luisa Somaini, «*Otto Pittori Italiani*» 1952–1954: *Afro, Birolli, Corpora, Moreni, Morlotti, Santomaso, Turcato, Vedova* Milan: Padiglione d'Arte Contemporanea, 1986.

4. For information on *Corrente*, see Ruth Ben-Ghiat, "The Politics of Realism: *Corrente di Vita Giovane* and the Youth Culture of the 1930s," (*Stanford Italian Review* VIII, no. 1–2 (1990): 139–64); Marina Pizziolo, ed., *Corrente e oltre: Opere dalla collezione Stellatelli, 1930–1990* (Palazzo della Permanente, Milan, 16 October–15 November 1998); and Giorgia Bottinelli, "The Art of Dissent in Fascist Italy: The Bottai Years, 1936–43" (Ph.D. diss., The Courtauld Institute of Art, 2000). Mussolini's interest in *Corrente* is recounted in Edoardo and Duilio Susmel, *Opera Omnia di Benito Mussolini*, vol. 30, 11/6/1940–3/1/1942 (Florence: La Fenice, 1960): 150, quoted and translated in Bottinelli, 122–23. For an overview, and contemporary, recounting of postwar Italian art, see Tristan Sauvage [Arturo Schwarz, pseud.], *Pittura italiana del dopoguerra* Milan: Schwarz Editore, 1957.

5. The best sources on the group are Giuseppe Marchiori, *Il Fronte Nuovo delle Arti* (Vercelli: Giorgio Tacchini Editore, s.r.l., 1978), *Il Fronte Nuovo delle Arti: Nascita di una avanguardia* (Vicenza: Basilica Palladiana, 13 September–16 November 1997), and Sauvage. A useful introduction in English, contemporary with the *Fronte Nuovo* itself, is Ingeborg Eichmann, "Letter from Italy: the *Fronte Nuovo*," *The Magazine of Art* 42.1 (January 1949): 68–71. My own dissertation, "*Il Fronte Nuovo delle Arti: Abstraction and Realism in Italian Painting at the Dawn of the Cold War, 1944–50*" (University of Delaware, 2006), seeks to revise and expand the historiography of this movement.

6. Roderigo di Castiglia [Palmiro Togliatti, pseud.]. "Segnalazioni." *Rinascita: Rassegna di politica e cultura italiana* V.11 (November 1948): 424.

7. The manifesto was published in *Forma* 1, Rome, March 1947. The manifesto was signed by Carla Accardi, Ugo Attardi, Pietro Consagra, Piero Dorazio, Mino Guerrini, Achille Perilli, Antonio Sanfilippo, and Giulio Turcato. A solid introduction to the group can be found in *FORMA 1* ("Attraverso le avanguardie" 32). Parma: Galleria d'Arte Niccoli, 1994.

8. In the 1948 "Second Manifesto of Spazialismo," Fontana and the other signers called for "the painting to come out from its frame and the sculpture from its bell jar." Lucio Fontana, "Second manifesto of Spazialismo," in *The Italian Metamorphosis, 1943–1968*. Ed. Germano Celant. New York: The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, 1994. 713.

9. The phrasing is taken from Jaleh Mansoor, who offers a remarkably insightful and lucid reading of Manzoni in her "Piero Manzoni: 'We Want to Organicize Disintegration,'" *October* 95 (Winter 2001): 28–53.

10. *Bonalumi: evoluzione continua tra pittura e ambiente* ("Attraverso le avanguardie" 38). Ed. Luca Massimo Barbero. Parma: Galleria d'arte Niccoli, 2000. 38.

11. Perhaps the most comprehensive publication on Vedova is *Emilio Vedova*. Ed. Ida Gianelli. Museo d'Arte Contemporanea, Castello di Rivoli, 1998.

12. This period of Vedova's production has been tracked, most recently, by Ursula Prinz. See her essay "For ever contemporary: To the space composition of the *Absurdes Berliner Tagebuch* by Emilio Vedova" and the others in *Emilio Vedova. Absurdes Berliner Tagebuch '64. Die Schenkung an die Berlinische Galerie*. Berlin: Berlinische Galerie, 2002. See also my "Baroque Space in Postwar Italian Painting" in *Baroque Tendencies in Contemporary Art*. Ed. Kelly Wacker. Cambridge Scholars Press, 2008.

13. These included references to anti-Fascist demonstrations in Italy, the Algerian revolution, the Spanish Civil War, the war in Indochina, John F. Kennedy, and a recent flooding of Italy's Po river as well as phrases such as "Two-thirds of liberation" and "Spain, tragic and sweet." For a fuller discussion of the opera's development, see Luigi Nono, "Alcune precisazioni du *Intolleranza 1960*." In *Luigi Nono. Scritti e colloqui*. Ed. Angela I. DeBenedictis. Milan: Ricordi-LIM, 2001. 100–15.

14. Originally published as "Arte Povera, Appunti per una guerriglia" *Flash Art* 5, Rome (November/December 1967); the essay is reprinted in English in Christov-Bakargiev (194–96).

15. Celant, in Christov-Bakargiev (194).