ROBERTO ROSELLINI (8 May 1906, Rome—3 June 1977, Rome, heart attack) made 45 films, but for many years he was best known in this country for his affair with Ingrid Bergman that developed while they were filming Stromboli (1949). She got pregnant, her marriage with Dr. Peter Lindstrom dissolved, and the tabloids fed on it for months. Nowadays it would be one paragraph in the morning gossip section of GMA. His last film was Il Messia (1978). In the decade before that he did several made-for-tv historical films. Some of his great films are Il Generale della Rovere (1959), Paisà (1946, Paisan). Here's the note on him in Leonard Maltin's Movie Encyclopedia: "The Italian director who pioneered that country's school of neorealist cinema, he is still best remembered for his early, lowbudget, shaky-camera works dealing with life in a country torn by war. An architect's son who began making shorts in 1938, Rossellini actually directed a few features sponsored by Italy's Fascist government during World War 2. In 1945, he created an international sensation with the wrenching, frank Open City. Shot almost entirely on location in real houses, apartments, and exteriors, its distinctly primitive look, combined with its moving storyline and a sterling performance by Anna Magnani, heralded a new era in filmmaking. Rossellini subsequently made Paisan (1946) and Germany Year Zero (1947) in this vein, but began moving toward a more polished, almost Romanticist style. He met Hollywood star Ingrid Bergman in the late 1940s after she wrote him a fan letter; they fell in love and had a child, and the resultant scandal (Bergman was married at the time) led to her virtual banishment from Hollywood. Together the two made several films (1949's Stromboli is the best known) highly regarded by cineastes but virtually unknown to mass audiences. They eventually married and had twins, one of whom is model/actress Isabella Rossellini. Their marriage broke up when Rossellini took up with (and impregnated) an Indian screenwriter in 1957. The year 1959 brought the director's first popular success in some time: General Della Rovere another WW2 story, this one starring fellow director Vittorio De Sica. In the 1960s Rossellini made several period pieces shot in a peculiarly rigorous style, including 1966's The Rose of Louis XIV. Thought incredibly ponderous by many, these films also have their admirers. Rossellini also contributed a scenario to a Godard film, 1962's Les Carabiniers. He continued working up until his death, making historical films for Italian TV."

ALDO FABRIZI (1 November 1905, Rome—2 April 1990, Rome, heart failure) was, writes Gary Brumburg on IMDB, "Beloved, hugely popular Italian comic character actor/writer/director, in music halls and variety shows for much of his early career. Fabrizi entered films in 1942 and often wrote and directed his vehicles, winning international acclaim in the Roberto Rossellini's neorealist drama Roma, città aperta (1946), in which he played a priest who bravely defies the fascist regime. Heavy in heart and girth, he performed primarily in Neopolitan films for over four decades. A master of the double take, he adapted equally well to comedy and drama, but did not earn much recognition in America. He devoted much of his time in later years to the culinary arts, writing several cookbooks and related poetry. He died of a heart ailment in his 85th year."

ANNA MAGNANI (7 March 1908, Rome—26 September 1973, Rome, pancreatic cancer) first appeared in film in Scampolo (1928). She would be in 49 more, including Roma (1972), The Secret of Santa Vittoria (1969), The Fugitive Kind (1959), Wild Is the Wind (1957), and The Rose Tattoo (1955), for which she won a best actress Oscar. Her bio from Leonard Maltin's Film Encyclopedia: "Legendary, powerful star of international films whom Andrew Sarris wrote "can tear a dramatic scene to tatters and in the next instant turn on a brilliant comedy style." She was born illegitimate and in poverty, raised by her maternal grandmother and educated in a convent. She studied at Rome's Accademia d'Arte Drammatica and at the same time, sang at nightclubs and performed in variety shows and then dramatic stock companies. She made her film debut with a bit part in Scampolo (1927), then later had a starring role in La Cieca di Sorrento/The Blind Woman of Sorrento (1934). After her marriage to director Goffredo Alessandrini (which was later annulled) she appeared mostly in supporting roles in films like Cavalleria (1936), La Fuggitiva and Teresa Venerdi (both 1941). It was her performance as a pregnant widow shot by Germans in Roberto Rossellini's neorealist classic Roma, Città Aperta/Open City (1945) that..."
made the world take notice; the film was ignored by Italian critics but hailed abroad. Magnani’s raw, emotional performance and unglamorous looks made her a star. She subsequently won the Best Actress Award at the Venice Film Festival as a woman who rallies tenement dwellers in L’Onorevole Angelina (1947), and starred in Rossellini’s Amore (1948), which originally consisted of the monologue La Voce Umana and the controversial II Miracolo/The Miracle in which Magnani beautifully played a peasant woman who believes her unborn child is Christ. She was also memorable as an actress in Renoir’s The Golden Coach (1952), a role he tailored for her. In Hollywood, she starred in The Rose Tattoo (1955) as Serafina Delle Rose, a part Tennessee Williams had originally written with her in mind for the Broadway stage, which she was unable to accept at the time. She won the Best Actress Oscar for her performance, but subsequent roles were less rewarding. She received another Oscar nomination as a mail-order bride in Wild Is the Wind (1957, opposite Anthony Quinn) and appeared in The Fugitive Kind (1959), Pasolini’s Mamma Roma (1962), The Secret of Santa Vittoria (1969) and, briefly, in Fellini’s Roma (1972), as herself. She died at 65. There was a tremendous public gathering at her funeral; for many she was, as Pauline Kael noted, "The actress who has come to be the embodiment of human experience, the most 'real' of actresses."


. . . The new film, Roma, città aperta (Rome, Open City), set out to evoke the history of the Roman people under German occupation.

In spite of the generosity of the sponsor, the money was never sufficient, and the film had to be shot under primitive conditions. The studios at Cinécittà were unusable, electric power was uncertain, and the film stock was of substandard quality. However, the desperate postwar conditions resulted in certain advantages. The hardship and devastation the filmmakers wanted to portray didn’t have to be artificially produced—they existed right there in the city. The mostly nonprofessional cast, “taken from the street,” had themselves lived through the privations and horrors of the occupation. Rossellini called this “a film about fear, the fear felt by all of us but by me in particular. I too had to go into hiding, I too was on the run, I had friends who were captured and killed.”

Open City (1945) had a mixed reception when it was first shown in Italy, where audiences wanted to forget the miseries and divisions of the recent past. Acceptance there grew after the film was acclaimed abroad, including in the United States, where the New York Film Critics chose it as the best film of 1946. It was praised for the powerful performances of Fabrizi and Magnani, and the use of nonprofessional actors, chosen for their physical appearance, was triumphantly vindicated. The employment of real locations and even the roughness of the filmstock contributed to the film’s raw immediacy, its appearance of newsreel authenticity. Rossellini’s direction was guided, he said, by the “situation of the moment” and reflected his own changing perceptions and an actor’s mood during shooting rather than strict adherence to the script.

It was the great success of Open City that first drew André Bazin, editor of Cahiers du Cinéma, praised Rossellini’s “integrity of style and a moral unity only too rare in cinema,” saying “there is no Italian director in whose work aims and forms are more closely linked.” Bazin goes on:
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At about this time, Rossellini made a statement that amounted to a manifesto: “I need a depth which perhaps only the cinema can provide, both the ability to see characters and objects from any angle and the opportunity to adapt and omit, to make use of dissolves and internal monologue (not, I might add, Joyce’s stream of consciousness, but rather that of Dos Passos) to take or leave, putting in what is inherent in the action and what is perhaps its distant origin. I will combine my talent with the camera to haunt and pursue the character: the pain of our times will emerge just through the inability to escape the unblinking eye of the camera.”

directly influenced by Rossellini’s improvisational and documentary tendencies, later made Le Mépris (1963) as a reflection on some of the themes of Viaggio. And Bertolucci, an Italian influenced both by Godard and Rossellini, has the cinephile in Before the Revolution (1964) say: “I saw Journey to Italy fifteen times. . . . Remember, you cannot live without Rossellini.”

Robin Wood says “If his art is faithful to certain neorealist principles, it also transcends them. One can state the relationship thus: all art is poised somewhere between exploration and statement… It is a question of which is the dominant impulse; and one can see that Rossellini’s art, though it certainly makes statements, is primarily motivated by the drive to understand. This implies that Rossellini’s camera is used primarily to record what is before it, without tricks or fakery, and with a minimum (though not an absence) of rhetoric; and that his work with actors, decor, landscape is a
process of investigation rather than an expression of foregone conclusions. The central paradox of Rossellini’s camera is that, while he sees the function of the camera as necessarily restricted to photographing the actual, material world, he is of all filmmakers the most rigorously and single-mindedly preoccupied with the spiritual and invisible. Nowhere is this paradox more vividly exemplified, nowhere are its seeming contradictions more successfully resolved, than in the Bergman films.

Rossellini believed that “neorealism consists of following someone with love and watching all his discoveries and impressions. . . . The camera does not leave the actor, and in this way the camera effects the most complex journeys.” Given these views, it is not surprising that he had always favored the long take.

The failure of his later films, and above all the fact that they were not understood by the masses (whose opinion he valued above that of critics) led Rossellini in 1965 to conclude that he was “useless.” As early as 1957, in an interview with André Bazin, he had spoken enthusiastically about television: “In modern society, men have an enormous need to know each other. Modern society and modern art have been destructive of man; but television is an aid to his rediscovery. Television, an art without traditions, dares to go out to look for man. . . . The television audience is quite different from that of the cinema. In television you’re talking not to the mass public but to ten million individuals; and the discussion becomes much more intimate, more persuasive.”


The film’s early reception as a quasi-documentary was probably due at least as much to its closeness to the events it reconstructed as to the way it was directed or photographed. These events had taken place in Rome in the first months of 1944 when it was under German occupation. Allied (British and US) troops had entered the city on 4 June 1944 and the film had begun to take shape that summer. The script was written between September and December 1944. The film went into production in January 1945, when the Germans still occupied the north of Italy and as Soviet troops were advancing west across Poland. It was post-produced in the summer of 1945 (all sound was post-synchronized) and its first public screening was in Rome on 24 September, five months after Italy was liberated and just three weeks after the Japanese capitulation in the Pacific. As Dino Risi put it, the film’s subject was still ‘scorching’.

Godard wrote in 1959 ‘all roads lead to Rome Open City.’

Rome Open City is rightly considered a key film in the history of cinema. It is a work of great emotion, indelibly stamped by the conditions of its making, by the war and the anti-Fascist struggle, and it is one of a number of works from that period to have established a movement toward a realistic and committed art. For all its dramatic manipulation of complex events into a linear story of defiance, courage, and redemptive hope it remains a brilliant portrayal of life in a city under occupation. However, it is important to be clear about what it is and what it is not. It was essentially a transition film—for Rossellini, for the cinema, for a society coming out of two decades of Fascism—rather than a wholly new kind of work. To put it another way, Rossellini may have reinvented the cinema, but not with Rome Open City. It is a hybrid, in which cinematic innovation is grafted onto dramatic convention, the values of anti-Fascism and working-class collectivism onto a narrative with a conservative sexual and social ethos. It is also a film where photographic documentation and historical testimony coexist with a mythical reconstruction of the past in which good memories are made to drive out bad.

. . . an important corrective to the view of neorealism as a direct transcription or recording of a real-world event into a film or literary text. What Rome Open City and other works from the early post-war period capture and preserve for posterity are not the raw events of the resistance but a set of already shaped representations of selected events.

In one respect, however, the film is, or at least contains, a documentary record. It includes photographic evidence of Rome at the end of the Second World War. It shows what the city and its inhabitants looked like in 1945 and it shows something of what the war did to the city, notably in the various shots of bomb-damaged buildings.

Rossellini, in one of his most revealing interviews, given towards the end of his life, said that making Rome Open City had been a way of ‘punishing’ himself for the artistic pretensions of his earlier films. His new approach consisted of ‘leaving to things their authenticity.’

Rome had first been declared an open city unilaterally by the Italian government on 14 August 1943 after the Allies had bombed it for a second time. The declaration, communicated through the Vatican, referred to Rome’s special status as a sacred city, ‘centre of the Catholic religion’. In fact, neither
declaration — August and 10 September—had any binding value. Rome could only have had effective open city status if the Allies, as well as the Germans, had agreed to recognise and respect it, but neither side did. For the next nine months German military convoys move regularly in and out of the city, which was the main hub of road and rail connections between north and south Italy, and there were small but repeated Allied bombing raids: Rome was bombed five times between 12 and 28 February 1944 alone. Insofar as the notion of the open city retained any significance during the German occupation it was, in the words of historian Enzo Collotti, in the limited sense that Rome was spared exposure to ‘massive acts of war, not least because of the predictable propaganda consequences and the need on the Germans’ part to maintain tolerable relations with the Vatican’. The Pope had pressured Kesselring, through the German ambassador at the Vatican, Weizsäcker, to respect the open city status and this probably affected Kesselring’s decision to withdraw his troops on 4 June without engaging in battle with the Allies in Rome itself.

For those in the underground movement the notion of the open city remained important because it represented an ideal to be restored and underlined the illegality of the German presence.

The filming of the city did not consist only of making a record of how Rome looked at the end of the war. It also involved a set of choices about how to depict it in reconstructing the city in a form that was still very polluted. The children whistling as the priest is shot is a moment with extreme long shots they conceal, as it were, within themselves the more detailed views of the city which the rest of the film reveals. As the story develops the spectator is taken into a form of seduction. It is sentimental and therefore seductive. I was trying to be honest but I was still tied to a certain kind of political purpose. To call it a myth does not amount to calling it a lie.

Five aspects of this shaping in Rome Open City are worth remarking upon in particular. First, there is the time in which the story takes place. The German occupation of Rome lasted nine months, from 11 September 1943 to 4 June 1944. The action of the film is compressed into a few days in winter, as is evident from the characters’ clothing, the stove alight in Don Pietro’s office and other references, notably in the dialogue between Pina and Francesco on the stairs, where the time is loaded with symbolism: ‘It seems like the winter is never going to end.’ ‘It will end, Pina, it will, and spring will return and it will be more beautiful than before because we will be free.’ There are no explicit references to dates in the film, but the purported time of events must be somewhere between late January and early March. By concentrating the story into this period the film leaves out on either side the two worst episodes of mass coercion and violence during the occupation: the round-up and deportation of Jews on 16-18 October 1943 and the Fosse Ardeatine massacre on 24 March 1944. The most likely reason why these two events are not alluded to in Rome Open City is that the memory of them was too painful and negative to be incorporated into a text which sought to tell a tale of courage and survival. They could be represented at the time in other works which sought to give a focus to collective anger or grief. These aims were present in Rossellini’s film too, but were secondary to its redemptive and affirmative function.

Second, the representation of Italian Fascists in the film shows them as passively subservient to the Germans. That the Germans were the dominant partner in the alliance with the Fascists is not in doubt, but this representation diminishes the latters’ responsibilities. The Italian Fascists also conducted their own operations of policing, arrests,
interrogations and torture. . . . By minimising the political autonomy of the Fascists in Rome, and by not showing the true extent of Fascist violence and espionage, Rossellini’s film in effect transfers all real responsibility for the crimes of this period onto the Germans.

Third, linked to this simplification of the role of the Italian Fascists is the lack of explicit representation of the divisions among the civilian population.

Fourth, the depiction of the priest, and more generally of the Catholic Church, in the film is redemptive.

Fifth, the film serves a mythical function in giving an impression of a unity of aim between parties and factions in the resistance.

The will to show the truth without embellishments produced a visual record of wartime Rome which was accurate in many respects. It also produced an account, of considerable historical value, of what it was like to live in the city under occupation and of how space and power interacted within it. At the same time the film’s depiction of space was made to serve a set of schematic moral oppositions, and the need to produce a ‘good memory’ led to a selective treatment of historical events, in which some were drawn into the foreground, while others were pushed into the background or omitted. These layers, however, coexist in the film without cancelling each other out.

On neorealism (from Liz-Anne Bawden, Ed., The Oxford Companion to Film 1976):

The term “neo-realism” was first applied. . . . to Visconti’s Ossessione (1942). At the time Ossessione was circulated clandestinely, but its social authenticity had a profound effect on young Italian directors De Sica and Zavattini, [who] adopted a similarly uncompromising approach to bourgeois family life. The style came to fruition in Rossellini’s three films dealing with the Second World war, the Liberation, and post-war reconstruction: Roma, città aperta (Rome, Open City, 1945), Paisà (Paisan/Ordinary People1947), and Germania, anno zero (Germany, Year Zero/Evil Street, 1947). With minimal resources, Rossellini worked in real locations using local people as well as professional actors; the films conveyed a powerful sense of the plight of ordinary individuals oppressed by political events. The roughness and immediacy of the films created a sensation abroad although they were received with indifference in Italy. . . .

By 1950 the impetus of neo-realism had begun to slacken. The burning causes that had stimulated the movement were to some extent alleviated or glossed over by increasing prosperity; and neo-realist films, although highly praised by foreign critics, were not a profitable undertaking: audiences were not attracted to realistic depictions of injustice played out by unglamorous, ordinary characters. De Sica’s Umberto D (1952) was probably the last truly neo-realist film. . . .

Although the movement was short-lived, the effects of neo-realism were far-reaching. Its influence can be traced across the world from Hollywood, where stylistic elements in films about social and political problems echoed those of the neo-realists, to India, where Satyajit Ray adopted a typically neo-realist stance in his early films. . . .

Karen Arnone’s Roberto Rossellini and Italian Cinema: The Search for Realism (http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/italians/Amiciprize/1996/) has a lot of very good material on Rossellini and his work.

This chronology of Italian Neorealist films comes from the best web sit on Italian Neorealism, http://www.inblackandwhite.com/ItalianNeorealismv2.0/index.html

1942 Ossessione (Obsession, Visconti)
1943 I bambini ci guardano (The Children Are Watching Us, De Sica)
1945 Roma, città aperta (Open City, Rossellini)
1946 Il bandito (The Bandit, Lattuada), Paisà (Rossellini), Sciuscià (Shoeshine, De Sica), Vivere in pace (To Live in Peace, Zampa)
1947 Caccia tragica (Tragic Hunt, De Santis), Il delitto di Giovanni Episcopo (Lattuada), Germania, anno zero (Germany, Year Zero, Rossellini), Il passatore (Coletti), La terra trema (The Earth Trembles, Visconti)
1948 Ladri di biciclette (The Bicycle Thief, De Sica), L’amore (Rossellini), Senza pietà (Without Pity, Lattuada)
1949 Il mulino del Po (The Mill on the Po, Lattuada), In nome della legge (Germi), Riso amaro (Bitter Rice, De Santis)
1950 Il cammino della speranza (Germi)
1951 Il brigante di Tacca del Lupo (Germi), Luci del varietà (Variety Lights, Lattuada/Fellini), Miracolo a Milano (Miracle in Milan, De Sica), Persiane chiuse (Comencini)
1952 Bellissima (Visconti), Roma, ore 11 (Rome, 11 o’clock, De Santis), Umberto D. (De Sica)

Join us next week, Tuesday, October 15 for

**Carol Reed’s The Third Man, 1949**

Joseph Cotten, Ailida Valli, Orson Welles, Trevor Howard, a zither and Robert Krasker’s Oscar-winning cinematography star in this classic, written by Graham Greene, Alexander Korda, Carol Reed and Orson Welles. Cannes Grand Prize.

**THE BFS MOTTO**: “Filmmaking seems to me a transitory and threatened art. It is very closely bound up with technical developments. If in thirty or fifty years the screen no longer exists, if editing isn’t necessary, cinema will have ceased to exist. It will have become something else. That’s already almost the case when a film is shown on television: the smallness of the screen falsifies everything.” Luis Buñuel.
other films, past films, and all the goldenrod handouts at http://buffalofilmseminars.com.
Write Diane at engdc@acsu.buffalo.edu. Write Bruce at bjackson@buffalo.edu.
Check out Buffalo's only free and independent news magazine at http://buffaloreport.com.