This volume originates in the interdisciplinary dialogue between two historians, one contemporary and the other of film, on the relationship between religious phenomena and media. More specifically, it investigates the ways in which the Catholic Church used cinema in particular – since it occupied a central position in the media system during the period taken in consideration – as a space for action within the complex dynamics of modern mass society. Following a handful of isolated and at times contradictory efforts, the Church’s engagement with cinema became institutionalized between the end of the thirties and the beginning of the forties, before changing in many ways towards the end of the seventies. The latter moment can be represented on the one hand by the emergence of explicit pornography, which in turn resulted from the fall of taboos related to obscenity, despite – but perhaps also as a consequence of – the rigid censorship of representations of sexuality promoted by the Church. On the other, it is embodied in the Church’s new and increasingly conscientious investment in the mass media. This book investigates the historical process that lead to this change.

The presence of the Vatican on the Italian territory is key to understanding the exceptionality of the Italian case, both for its direct or indirect consequences on the general development of the film industry and for the way it influenced the Italian Catholic Church’s film policy. This volume intends to provide an outline of the relationship between Catholicism and cinema with a specific focus on Italy. It relies on new sources and employs an entirely original approach which combines the analysis of archive materials – an approach typical to historical studies of
institutional apparatuses – and the analysis of cultural formation and representation – an approach typical to cultural studies.

The most productive way to address the complexity of the questions that underlie this volume is to focus on the couplet of modernization/modernity, conforming thus to recent trends in historiography. With this in mind, it is necessary to offer a preliminary definition of the use of these concepts within our analysis.

The paradigm of modernity, which oriented historical studies for much of the previous century as a genuine “grand narrative” of historical development, on the one hand “emphasizes the effects of continuous technological progress, of the growing density of communication […] , of the increasing variety of types of knowledge and social functions;” on the other “it explains the conflicts underlining the rift between the push to modernize and those traditional groups which are left behind, or which resist assimilation into the modern world.”1 This paradigm has naturally provided a starting point for studies of the relationship between the Catholic Church (a stronghold of tradition that is two thousands years old) and cinema (the previous century’s modern technology par excellence).2 Gian Piero Brunetta’s early studies in this area – which painted a radically antithetical and conflictual image of the two sides, centred on the Church’s great refusal of cinema’s modernity – are deeply influenced by this paradigm.3

By now it is widely accepted that modernity cannot provide a category for unambiguous, rigidly defined historical interpretation. We know that the concept can be analysed

---

and employed from multiple perspectives: from economic transformations to social, cultural, gender or political ones, and so forth. As a result, studies must differentiate between the effects of modernity at the different levels of individual consciences, groups and institutions. As Giovanni Filoramo has written,

> today, in the light of globalization and the profound transformations in the multiculturalism of our societies, the comparative study of these processes leads us to underline, much more decisively than in the past, the fact that communities, societies, states and therefore also religious traditions experience very different rhythms of development and responses to the challenges of modernity.4

As an effect of this new approach, we are able to go beyond the notion that religion and modernity are two irreconcilable entities, and introduce interpretative frameworks that reveal their interactive and surprisingly dynamic connections.5

In place of facile interpretative models that are situated at the polar ends of a spectrum – whereby religion is intended as a “refusal of modernity and its values” or, vice versa, as “a dynamic, propulsive push for change” – today scholarship gives greater credit to a “third kind of response […] halfway between the two previous ones,” that seeks “a reasonable compromise between the need for change and conservation.”6 Modernization is the historiographic concept that is more useful when defining this third model of interpretation: in essence, it refers to the creation of a new research perspective that invites us to “understand the modernity of religions in modernity.”7 This approach aims to capture the dynamic processes through which Catholicism has interacted with modernity, creating parallels between the evolution of the Catholic movement and those of contemporary mass

---

7 Staf Hellemans, p. 121.
movements. In turn, this enables a more precise understanding of the “ever possible bind between Catholicism’s modernization and the persistent refusal of modernity.”8 There is a fundamental assumption taking place at the basis of these analyses: before the changes following the Second Vatican Council forged new modes of interacting with the modern world, the Catholic Church – which persisted in its intransigent objective of Christian social restoration, following the model of medieval *christianitas*9 – was simultaneously an integral part of modernity and nonetheless critically disposed towards it. According to Daniele Menozzi, between the two Wars Catholicism came to elaborate a clear and composite method of defining what attitude to adopt in relation to the modern world:

> the point-blank refusal of the principles of modernity was bound to the tendency to subsume all of modern culture’s tools under the vigilant eye of the hierarchy, the only authority entitled to make sure that the intended modernization would not turn into modernism, that is, in the insidious infiltration into the Church structure of those modern values that were to be uncompromisingly opposed.10

This method captures Catholicism’s dual, ambiguous “performance” in the modern world, that Church historian and sociologist of religion Staf Hellemans summarizes as follows: “objectively rooted in, and yet subjectively stubbornly resisting modernity.”11

In light of these academic trends, how can we examine the relationship between Catholicism and cinema? Scholarship by Francesco Casetti decisively moves beyond the oppositional
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9 For a clarification of this interpretative framework, we refer to the canonical works Giovanni Miccoli, *Fra mito della cristianità e secolarizzazione. Studi sul rapporto chiesa-società nell’età contemporanea* (Casale Monferrato: Marietti, 1985); Daniele Menozzi, *La chiesa cattolica e la secolarizzazione* (Torino: Einaudi, 1993).
11 Staf Hellemans, 122.
perspective represented by Brunetta’s work, elaborating instead a negotiational perspective. In a 2003 essay focused on the Fascist period, Casetti and Elena Mosconi observe the Catholics’ need to “rethink” their interest in cinema “within the furrow of modernization and massification processes that affect society in its entirety.” The two academics, both affiliated to the area of Film and Media Studies, thus inserted themselves into an ongoing debate in historical studies of Catholicism that perceives the concept of modernization as a hermeneutic category, which allows us to transcend rigid dichotomies in analyses of the relationship between Catholicism and modernity. Casetti and Mosconi interpret the Catholics’ experience with the mass media in terms of “a prudent modernization.”


and Silvio Alovisio, on the relationship between the Church and early cinema, the Catholics’ pedagogical approach to the new medium is demonstrated to be the way in which they came to “accept modernity” as expressed by cinema. In particular, the shift from a “scheduling pedagogy” to a “textual pedagogy” with which the Church accompanied the parallel transition from early to institutionalized cinema reveals how it had began to “regulate” and “discipline” the movie-going experience according to its own methods and objectives: the birth of Catholic censorship of (filmic) texts according to the Church’s moral magisterium implied not “the refusal and the fear of what is new and modern but, on the contrary, the full legitimation of ‘healthy modernity’.”

However, there is little doubt that one of the central aspects of Catholic modernization in this light was, as various studies reveal, the desire to appropriate several elements of scientific and technological modernity. This desire is “extremely evident” when it comes to means of mass communication. This is the context of that “conservative modernization,” the terminology used by Renato Moro for the Italian case between the two Wars, according to which Catholicism, over a backdrop that was broadly conditioned by Fascism, realized “a selective openness to modernity,” privileging its “technological aspects,” and therefore looking to “an attempt at an organizational ‘update’ rather than a cultural and religious one.” Broader studies of the relationship between the Catholics and the development of mass communication (from older work on mass culture, the press and public opinion, to more

---

recent contributions on publishing, radio and television do not contradict these interpretative frameworks: in approaching modern culture and its new tools, the actions of the Church confirmed less a transformation that enabled it to recognize new social attitudes and needs than a process of technological updating. Nevertheless, developments in thought on the transnational dimension of cinema, the identification of new periodizing markers in the development of modern mass culture, and especially the evolution over the past fifteen years of what has


been called New Cinema History\textsuperscript{25} demand further verification of these interpretative frameworks, enhancing our approach through an interdisciplinary perspective in view of new questions and new sources.

Studies on the fall of taboos related to obscenity, on the progressive sexualization of cinema and on the appearance of pornography in Italy\textsuperscript{26} have provided a crucial element in our understanding of the non-linear relationship between the Church and cinema’s modernity. This relationship cannot be represented as a progressive acceptance (no matter how prudent and instrumental) of the tools (more than the values) of modernity, but rather it alternates between episodes of slow progress and abrupt retreats. On certain issues in particular (like the aforementioned case of the representation of sexuality), the fundamental contradictions at the base of the Church-cinema relationship literally explode, undermining the reassuring syntheses that were established through the “negotiation approach.” In this line of research, and in line with the methodology proposed by New Cinema History, it is vital to develop interpretative models that can integrate the normalizing pressures of high-level institutions which act “top down” on the faithful (the Secretary of State of the Holy See, the Pontifical Council for Social Communications, the CCC), with those that move in the opposite direction, rising up from the bottom to the hierarchy, pushing for difficult (and not always possible) renegotiations (through film criticism, popular reception, parish cinema communities, organized collective and individual dissent). In other words, it is necessary to investigate the phenomenon considered in this volume in its entirety and complexity; one must create interpretative models for Church policy that account for doctrinal and regulatory development as


much as for its concrete effects on beliefs and practices, and for the support of religious film production as much as the efforts to tackle obscene cinema. The clamorous failures in the latter area upset the “negotiation model,” raising several doubts about the responsibility of the Church itself for the progressive pornification of society from the second half of the ’70s. For Peppino Ortoleva, the rapid and intense process that led to the fall of taboos related to obscenity in very few years (which he describes as the “breaking of a dam that many would have defined unbreakable until few years before”27) was also a consequence of the Church’s rigid approach to the crucial issue of the representation of sexuality.

By focusing on the relationship between the Catholics and cinema’s modernity, our interpretation therefore revisits not only Brunetta’s “oppositional model,” but in some ways also the “negotiation model” proposed by Casetti (which had first surpassed the oppositional one). The concept of “modernization without modernity” (that is, the idea that Catholic culture’s negotiation with modernity inspired no real exchange of values, but was instead mostly instrumental) and the non-linearity of negotiation processes (which had substantial inconsistencies and abrupt steps backwards when it came to some particularly thorny issues) force us to critically examine the “negotiation model” in light of several new questions. On a political and geopolitical level: in what way did cinema’s genetically transnational character influence the approach of the Catholic Church – whose perspective was, by nature, global? What was its attitude towards macroscopically transnational phenomena such as the cinematic experiences that developed in the Soviet Union and the United States? Are there continuities or discontinuities in its relationship with cinema in Fascist Italy and Christian-Democratic Italy? On a social and anthropological level: in what way did cinema influence the redefinition of the pedagogical models or the social and sexual morals of the Catholic Church? How did the Church address cinema’s ability to modify the Catholics’ frame of mind, aspirations and points of reference? On a theological and devotional-religious level: how was cinema integrated into the Catholic Church’s traditional use of images? What theological issues did the

27 Peppino Ortoleva, pp. 170-171.
cinematographic apostolate pose in relation to cinema? Under what conditions could a cinematic image become a devotional means?

These essential questions will provide the guiding thread for our proposed interpretation. By relating the debate on modernization and modernity to the specific issue of the cinematographic representation of the sacred on the one hand, and of sexuality on the other (the two main problems that inspired the Holy See’s film policy, especially in Italy) this book questions the aforementioned oppositional and negotiation approaches in light of several unpublished sources. The analysis in the first part of this book (focused on the 1930s) reveals certain foreshadowing dynamics that were to characterize the post-war years – which is subsequently the focus of the second part. This included: first of all, the increasing centralization of decision-making processes and Catholic film policy, marked, as they were, by very evident clericalization; secondly, the emergence of the strategic role played by the Jesuits, the cultural, Catholic intelligentsia par excellence, with their concrete experience in media and culture; thirdly, the Holy See’s clear intention to invest in the autonomous production of documentaries centred on the living Pontiff, which then become the only entirely legitimate cinematographic products to represent the sacred in a theologically correct way; and finally, the Holy See’s stance on censorship in its multifarious expressions (classification, lobbying with state institutions, the establishment of a network of parish cinemas in order to influence production) as a crucial issue for Catholic film policy, given the power exerted by cinema on the viewer’s conscience.

Although the structure of the volume originated from constant, interdisciplinary dialogue between the two authors, this interpretive approach necessitated a two-part structure for the volume, each focusing on a determined period, in order to exploit and enhance fully the specificity of each research perspective and the different sources used. The first part was written by Gianluca della Maggiore, the second by Tomaso Subini.
Note

Documents in Italian are quoted in English (the translation is ours). The original Italian text is reported in the corresponding footnote. Documents in Latin have been left in Latin (the English translation is available in the corresponding footnote). Documents in French have been left in French.

With regard to the documents available online (https://users.unimi.it/cattoliciecinema/) in the database of the PRIN research project on Catholics and cinema, coordinated by Milan Statale University: documents available in the PRIN database come both from indexed archives and from archives which have not yet been ordered: in the former case, source verification can be carried out on the scans available in the database as well as in the archive in which the documents are preserved. Documents are therefore identified in the footnotes by a double description: one with which they are indexed in real archives (if available) and another referring to the PRIN database (indicated within parentheses). After the first occurrence, each document is identified solely through database abbreviation.

Document numbers are indicated in English, with the single exception of documents from the Vatican Secret Archives, which explicitly requested that document numbers be left in Italian.

Volumes and articles in Italian are quoted in English (the translation is ours, if no English translation was available). Volumes and articles in French have been left in French.

List of abbreviations

ACEC: Associazione Cattolica Esercenti Cinema (Catholic Exhibitors’ Association)
ACI: Azione Cattolica Italiana (Italian Catholic Action)
ANEC: Associazione Nazionale Esercenti Cinema (Commercial Exhibitors’ Association)
CCC: Centro Cattolico Cinematografico (Catholic Cinematographic Centre)
CEI: Conferenza Episcopale Italiana (Italian Episcopal Conference)
CUCE: Consorzio Utenti Cinematografi Educativi (Consortium of Educational Cinema Users)
DC: Democrazia Cristiana (Christian Democracy Party)
ECER: Ente per la Cinematografia Educativa e Religiosa (Office for Educational and Religious Cinema)
IECI: International Educational Cinematograph Institute
LUCE: L’Unione Cinematografica Educativa (Educational Cinematographic Union)
MPPDA: Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America
NCWC: National Catholic Welfare Council
OCIC: Organization Catholique Internationale du Cinéma (International Catholic Office for Cinema)
ONB: Opera Nazionale Balilla (National Youth Club)
OND: Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro (National Recreational Club)
PCA: Production Code Administration
PSI: Partito Socialista Italiano (Italian Socialist Party)
RAI: Radiotelevisione italiana (Italian Radio and Television)
SCAEC: Società Cattolica Assistenza Esercizi Cinema (Catholic Society for Support to Cinematographic Exhibition)

s.d.: sine data
Pos.: Posizione (position)
Fasc.: Fascicolo (folder)
f: foglio (sheet)
ff: fogli (sheets)
r: recto
v: verso
a: anno (year)
rubr.: rubric

Archives

AA.EE.SS.: Congregazione degli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari presso l’Archivio Segreto Vaticano (Sacred Congregation for International Affairs at Vatican Secret Archive)
ACEC Archive: Archivio Associazione Cattolica Esercenti Cinema (Catholic Exhibitors’ Association Archive)
ACS: Archivio Centrale dello Stato (Centrale State Archive)
AFMER: Archivio storico della Provincia di Cristo Re dei frati minori dell’Emilia Romagna (Historical Archive of the Provincia di Cristo Re dei frati minori dell’Emilia Romagna)
ANT: Archivio Nazareno Taddei (Nazareno Taddei Archive)
ASDMI: Archivio Storico della Diocesi di Milano (Historical Archive of the Milan Diocese)
ASILS: Archivio Storico dell’Istituto Luigi Sturzo (Historical Archive of the Luigi Sturzo Institute)
ASV: Archivio Segreto Vaticano (Vatican Secret Archive)
CEI Archive: Archivio Conferenza Episcopale Italiana (Italian Episcopal Conference Archive)

ISACEM Archive: Archivio dell'Istituto per la storia dell'Azione Cattolica e del Movimento Cattolico in Italia Paolo VI (Archive of the Institute for the History of Catholic Action and the Catholic Movement in Italy Paul VI)

S.RR.SS.: Sezione per i Rapporti con gli Stati presso l'Archivio Segreto Vaticano (Section for Relations with States at Vatican Secret Archive)