

No Fear No Regret:
Oleg Maltsev and the Mythical History of Salvatore Giuliano

Raffaella Di Marzio

Center for Studies on Freedom of Religion Belief and Conscience

raffaelladimarzio@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: In 2018, the Applied Sciences Association produced the documentary movie *No Fear No Regret*, devoted to the life, death, and mythologization of Sicilian bandit Salvatore Giuliano (1922–1950). The movie is relevant for a study of the theories of Oleg Maltsev, as it analyzes the bandit’s career from the point of view of the three main branches of the Applied Sciences Association’s activities: Fate Analysis, weapon handling and the study of criminal traditions, and the Association’s peculiar view of history. The article discusses the movies’ approach to Giuliano, and compares it to the existing scholarship on the Italian outlaw.

KEYWORDS: Oleg Maltsev, Salvatore Giuliano, Fate Analysis, Applied Sciences Association, Sicilian Bandits.

Introduction

This paper discusses the 2018 documentary movie *No Fear No Regret*, produced in 2018 by the Applied Sciences Association (Unsolved Crimes and International Schicksalsanalyse Community Research Institute 2018), whose subject is the Sicilian bandit Salvatore Giuliano (1922–1950).

The movie is an in-depth search for the “real” Giuliano, conducted for a large part through interviews to members of the Applied Sciences Association who specialize in various fields relevant for the study, and who participated in fieldwork in Sicily in the area where the bandit used to operate. It is based on the idea that some general principles and theories studied by academic science, as well as the methods elaborated by the Applied Sciences Association, are applicable to a great variety of subjects and characters. One special category of

interest to the Association includes historical characters whose heritage remains in the collective memory long since after their death. Even in case of criminals, they remain “unforgettable” and their image becomes “mythological,” both inside and outside their original social and cultural milieu.

The movie is of special interest for the study of Applied Sciences Association, as it involves the three branches of the activities of the movement, namely the Fate Analysis theories of Leopold Szondi (1893–1986), weapon handling and the study of the world’s criminal traditions, and the peculiar view of history of the Association, which is presented as “scientific” but also takes into account the role of what it calls “European mysticism.” I will analyze the movie from these three points of view, and conclude by comparing it to the existing scholarship on Giuliano.

The Movie: A Psychological Experiment

No Fear No Regret includes pictures and footage of Giuliano, but is mostly structured around interviews and statements by the leader of the Applied Sciences Association, Oleg Maltsev, other students of the Association, including Marina Ilyusha, who serves as the head of its Fate Analysis division, journalists Ekaterina Sidorova and Konstantin Slobodyanuk, and camerapersons and photographers Alexey Samsonov and Marina Saparkina, plus an anonymous veteran of the Soviet secret service GRU, whose face is not shown. Maltsev exhibits a certain familiarity with multiple sources on Giuliano. Both he and the others have visited Giuliano’s home village in Sicily, Montelepre, interviewed relatives and acquaintances of the bandit, or their descendants, and read a Russian translation, specially prepared for the group, of the book by Giuliano’s sister and her son (Giuliano and Sciortino 1987).

The movie is, in a way, pedagogical. Sidorova and Ilyusha turn into advocates of Giuliano, reconstructing his confrontation with the Italian authorities in a romantic way. Ilyusha states that, as a woman, she “feels total respect for him.” Sidorova believes that

Salvatore Giuliano truly had a pure heart, despite all his actions. Maybe some are going to condemn me for what I am telling right now ... yes, he had killed and executed people, but I as a journalist and a woman think that this person had a pure heart.

And she concludes,

Based on his acts—yes, I have already stated in the beginning of the interview, maybe some will condemn me and will disagree with my opinion, but I am speaking honestly and sincerely, the way I think. And yes, I think that he was much more honest, more just, and deserved the life more than the ones who fought against him.

Here, with the political massacre at a meeting of left-wing activists in Portella della Ginestra, Sicily, on May 1, 1947, which left 11 dead including a woman and three children, conveniently left out, Giuliano is perceived as the romantic champion of the women and the poor mistreated by landlords and authorities. The homicides are justified with the argument that he was in a situation of war, by killing some saved the lives of many others, and had no choice. This may well have been true for his first killing, in 1943, of a “Carabiniere” (i.e. an officer of the Italian military police) who would have otherwise killed him after Giuliano was stopped carrying two sacks of black market grain (something very common in Sicily at that time), but not for the others.

Marina Saparkina, who translated the book by Giuliano’s sister, also admits her attitude towards the bandit:

[The] person who is translating the book has a peculiar attitude towards the book, it is a different level of getting inside the story, maybe you have seen yourself in the role of somebody in the book?

I cannot see a total identification with his sister, but there was a feeling that this Salvatore Giuliano is my brother. Not that much that “I am his sister,” but that “he is my brother” ... somebody very close ...

Do I understand correctly, you have felt so much that Salvatore is your brother, that you were ready to take up arms and follow the lead of this person?

Yes.

Basically the book can bring one into this kind of a state?

Definitely yes.

Would it matter on what territory, country you would take up the arms for him?

If there is a person as Salvatore Giuliano nothing matters at all ...

What the movie wants to show here is a process where who and what somebody really was is distorted through fake news we end up perceiving as real. Sidorova’s experience, in particular, is presented as a cautionary narration about “prejudice,” in the etymological sense of pre-judgement. Our judgement about a

character we are confronted with is influenced, and in fact distorted, by information we have absorbed beforehand. Even if we are confronted with new information, we come to the wrong conclusions, because we filter the information through what we believe we already know. Actually, the filter works so effectively that any new information is distorted so that it would support our prejudice, even if in fact it does contradict it.

However, by the end of the movie, both Ilyusha and Sidorova admit that they may have been misled by the mythical image of Giuliano in the book written by the bandit's sister and by the collective memory of the villagers in Montelepre, who in turn "remember" the myth more than real facts.

Ilyusha concludes,

It seems to me that, I might be mistaken, but it seems that it is like a neuropsychogram for each of us who gave the interviews, for the ones who have studied the book, what one remembers ... basically one really sees only what is being shown to him. I can clearly see the way I perceive information that is being shown to you [...] no matter where you look ... it is full of lies.

Sidorova confesses,

I looked at this story from a feminine perspective, with a kind heart, a naive one, which wants to believe in heroes, in magic. This was my perspective. [...] I understand that I have been carrying out somebody else's scenario, I was looking and believing what was being written. Especially, as a woman I was very inclined! Having read of his attitude towards children, mothers ...

At the end, she comes to the conclusion that even this "family" attitude may be part of the myth.

In this sense, as Maltsev states towards the end, the movie is a "psychological experiment." It shows that, in the presence of a mythical life such as Giuliano's, even professionals are carried out and have a natural inclination to believe the myth. He observes that the same would happen with many other subjects, including Jesus Christ. We perceive what we expect to perceive,

[There is a] very well known Princeton psychological experiment ... when there is a photo shown to an audience, which hears that the person on the photo is a maniac, a bad person ... and when the audience is asked about what they can tell about the person, they say ... his eyes resemble the eyes of a maniac, look at his fingers ... as if he wants to do something nasty. Then the next audience comes in to see the same photo, and they are being told that this is a famous poet, a Nobel Prize winner, he loved children very much. The reaction of the audience is completely different ... look at this bright and intelligent face. This experiment

shows us that a pre-set determines an attitude towards the subject—for this reason, one always makes a mistake when having a certain pre-set.

Fate Analysis

Fate Analysis, the psychoanalytic doctrine of Leopold Szondi, is one of the pillars of the Applied Sciences Association's worldview. It assumes that the family unconscious, i.e. the genes of our ancestors, determine many of our choices.

Szondi was an Hungarian psychoanalyst, whose work is generally regarded as part of deep psychology as a scientific discipline. Szondi does not reject the theories of either Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) or Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961), but supplements them with a third approach to the unconscious. For Freud, the unconscious manifests itself through symptoms; for Jung, through symbols; for Szondi, through the choices we make throughout our lives. Just as Freud and Jung, Szondi elaborated his doctrine, Fate Analysis, by using as his starting point his clinical experiences with several patients. He came to the conclusion that life's fundamental choices, present and future behavior, and the features of evolution of personal destiny have as their root cause the dialectical relationship between genetical impulses inherited from our family and external circumstances (Kiss 2015).

Szondi was aware of the new discoveries of neuroendocrinology, and their relevance for genetics. He considered in particular the mental problems of children, which were being explained with hereditary traits. Based on this research, Szondi elaborated the notion of genotropism, which is the attraction between carriers of the same genes. Two persons who carry similar genetic material may feel attracted to each other, and manifest in the process regressive hereditary traits. Family unconscious, according to Szondi, influences the choice of our partner, but also of our friends, as well as our health problems and the circumstances of our death.

Szondi believed that our life develops in a field where six forces are active: heritage, impulses, the social milieu, the mental milieu, ego, and spirit, the latter defined as “the highest court of fate” (Szondi 1953, 15–34). The first four forces are the factors of compulsive fate, and are independent from our will. Nobody can choose his or her genetic heritage or social milieu at the time of birth. The last two factors belong to selective fate, through which we take decisions and solve

problems. Each of the six factors may become predominant in one or another stage of our life, but only ego and spirit are responsible for our free choices. Ego takes free decisions and spirit implements them, because it is in the spirit that we find ideas and values allowing transcendental experiences. Ego serves as a bridge between the factors of compulsive fate and spirit. In turn, spirit is the transcendental instance giving to impulses features and directions that are truly human.

The six factors may emerge simultaneously or alternatively, in agreement or in opposition between each other, creating a never-ending dialectic whereby we are continuously transformed. Theater is a very important metaphor for Szondi. As the scenes change in a revolving stage, so fate changes in our life. The family unconscious influences every choice. However, choices remain ultimately free and fate can be changed, more easily if we understand and realize the role of the family unconscious.

The movie tests Fate Analysis against Salvatore Giuliano, but runs into the obstacle that most of what we know about the bandit may be mythological or simply false. Maltsev explains,

[...] when people say “Dr. Maltsev could you please make a fate analytical assessment of Salvatore Giuliano”, I reply that I can’t. Which Salvatore out of two [the mythical and the real] should I analyze? Any movie, any painting, any scientific work is faulty from the beginning if the primary materials are false. If the foundation of the raw material is erroneous, consequently your answer will be based on an error. Simple mathematical equation. If the benchmark data are erroneous, and you enter them into a computer program, logically the output is going to give you erroneous result data.

However, Fate Analysis can be used in a different way, and may actually help disentangling the real Giuliano from the mythological one. Maltsev suggests in an early stage of the movie that “by means of methods of Fate Analysis, we are going to solve the tangle anyways. And I am going to demonstrate things you do not see behind the curtain of this enigma.” Fate Analysis assumes that family unconscious is *always* at work. The mythological Giuliano exhibits traits that are not compatible with a Sicilian family unconscious and are typically American. This is not surprising. Maltsev argues, as it were largely American journalists who initially created the myth, later consecrated by novelists such as Mario Puzo (1920–1999) (Puzo 1984).

In Maltsev’s words,

In fact, Salvatore Giuliano did exist, but that Salvatore Giuliano that we know of today did not exist, never. Second, Salvatore is a mix of an American Salvatore and a Sicilian one. Let me try to explain my point, Salvatore Giuliano is a great man, a classical hero of an American thriller. Let us start from the hero himself ... An American hero is considered the one who does “bang-bang”, you know ... that’s a hero. Things are different in Sicily, though. The American understanding of a hero would be one who wages a war, in Sicily it is not done this way. Pay attention to the following: “Fighter for freedom of Sicily” corresponds to an American character. “Bandit Salvatore Giuliano” is a Sicilian character.

Thus, “this Sicilian is an American one, he is not a Sicilian one if we are speaking from a Fate Analysis perspective.” Although it is true that Giuliano waved separatist flags and toyed (or was persuaded to toy) with the idea of making Sicily part of the United States (which to many did not seem absurd during World War II), he was a simple Sicilian peasant with no elaborate political ideology. Once this upper layer superimposed by American (and Italian) “mythologization” is removed, Fate Analysis may reconstruct the truly Sicilian traits of the bandit. Marina Ilyusha is interviewed in the movie as a Fate Analysis specialist.

Could we assume that a certain ancestral figure stepped forward and “took the place” of Salvatore Giuliano?

Certainly, it might be the case. It might be possible that in the ancestral unconscious of Salvatore Giuliano there are figures that had influenced his fate [...].

Ilyusha notices how Giuliano is presented as uniquely fearless, as demonstrated by the dialogues between the bandit and his mother, reported by his sister. No matter how close he comes to danger and death, there is no fear in Giuliano. He went beyond the normal drive to survival, and this fearlessness helped him to fully control his emotions in extreme circumstances, where many others would lose their capacity to think and act rationally.

The Applied Sciences Association also focuses on skills, and distinguish them between innate and acquired. This is indeed a perpetual question in the history of psychology: are skills, particularly exceptional skills, innate or acquired? The answer is never clear-cut. Rather, there is a continuum where it is not easy to establish a clear boundary between acquired and innate skills. According to Ilyusha, ancestral influences explain something of Giuliano, but not all, not

that strange invulnerability, absolute fearlessness, and pay attention to the fact he did not feel regret about things he had done. Salvatore Giuliano does not feel guilty, he sleeps well at night, he doesn’t have nightmares ... 400 issued arrest warranties ... 80 killed Carabinieri

and he is not being haunted by bleeding thoughts. Isn't this strange, or is it possible after special training?

It is possible, provided there is a special training namely of the psyche, there has to be the “flexibility of the psyche” and I will repeat, a necessity of that reason, which basically justifies everything. That reason is higher and bigger than even death of those people.

One is not normally born with these attitudes:

Marina, could you tell, if one is born with this kind of logic or is it developed in the process of life?

I tend to think, that in this case he had developed the skills.

Ilyusha sees a play in Giuliano between ancestral unconscious and natural skills on the one hand, and some special training we do not know about or at least not mentioned on current biographies.

We see even from the book [by Giuliano's sister], we can see that he demonstrated leadership qualities from the early childhood, the sense of justice. However, one with such level of preparation went through a certain training and preparation [...]

In the standard mode of preparation, is it possible to achieve that effect?

No, there has to be a very dexterous ability to control yourself, your own psyche. This person knows every step in advance, which requires a preparation. Every person has a great potential, surely enough ancestral unconscious influences the life of a human being, as well as his skills. But anyways, there has to be the hand of a master who can maximize quickly and thoroughly unleash that great potential and turn it into a masterpiece. [...]

Yes. I think that this person went through a special training, because a regular person's psyche is much more different, there are boundaries such as self-preservation, safety of one's body, one's life. But he did not have these things. Thus, a regular person without a preparation won't have been able to be that cold-blooded in his fightings, to go forward no matter what. I think he was trained on a very high level, let me repeat, most probably he went through the training somewhere that we do not know about.

Giuliano, according to Ilyusha, also appears to have been attracted by death, an unusual but not unknown feature in Fate Analysis:

Note that Salvatore Giuliano had sufficiently, fatal conception of his beliefs. If we speak in terms of Fate Analysis, his fatal conception of his beliefs, his choice is ... death. Yes, right from the beginning.

“Fatal conception” is a term coming from Szondi, and indeed for Ilyusha Giuliano was so rational and quick in his decisions precisely because he was able to decide within a fatal framework. This means that he knew he would die soon, but considered that it was preferable to die than to betray his fate. However, this

“fatal” conception had to be acquired through a training, at the end of which death, either Giuliano’s or his victims’, did not really matter, because he had learned how to focus on something he regarded as more important.

In the narrative of Applied Sciences Association, Fate Analysis is never presented alone. It is related to the Association’s view of history. In turn, historical conclusions are grounded on a discussion based on the second pillar of the Association’s worldview, the study of weapon handling techniques and criminal traditions.

Weapon Handling and Criminal Traditions

One of the reasons Giuliano was fearless is that he believed he could be quicker in using guns than the Carabinieri, or everybody else. In a discussion with Alexey Samsonov, a photography specialist, Giuliano emerges as a master fighter, always quicker with guns than his opponents,

and we are speaking of his fighting skills on the distance, we are not considering tactics, strategy and management—we could have divided these skills in some categories. In order to be never off the mark with a gun, one has to be invulnerable and hit the target at the same time. ... That would entail position choice, understanding of what to do next, etc ... and all that in a split second.

It is not coincidental that the matter is discussed with a photographer, as Maltsev, who has a keen interest in new and old cameras, believes that photography and the use of guns have a lot in common. But the conclusion is the same. Somebody should have taught fighting techniques to Giuliano.

In essence, it is impossible to say that he was born this way.

No, not possible.

As for who taught Giuliano, various possibilities are discussed, the American intelligence being a credible candidate. Konstantin Slobodyanuk is brought in, as editor of the Association’s *Unsolved Crimes* magazine and one who has accompanied Maltsev in his study of criminal traditions. Slobodyanuk’s original insight is that Giuliano’s character does not fit into the Sicilian tradition of the Mafia and is much more similar to the style of a different criminal organization, the Ndrangheta of nearby Calabria. This conclusion is based on different features of Giuliano’s career. First, Slobodyanuk, as a journalist specialized in

criminology, specifically sees something more Calabrese than Sicilian in the bandit's approach to family life as described by his sister in her book. Second, in the making of Salvatore Giuliano, if one believes the sister, external figures play a role, including Catholic priests and a university professor he is said to have consulted. This is not unheard of in the Mafia, but is much more typical of Ndrangheta, as

in the Mafia everything occurs inside of the structure, inside of the so called ship. There is the captain, who teaches; boatswain, officers, etc. In this case, we see a certain professor that has no relation to criminal structures, but at a certain point he suddenly tells [Giuliano] that the organization exists. That "there is an organization you asked for, which is ready to defend interests of Sicilians to the bitter end."

Third, we saw Giuliano's lieutenants moving outside Sicily after he died, which Slobodyanuk again believes to be more typical of Ndrangheta than of the more territorial Mafia. He goes one step further, and lends some credibility to the persistent Sicilian stories that Giuliano's death may have been a hoax. He believes he may have been relocated elsewhere, either (or both) by Ndrangheta or the U.S. intelligence, which may have been interested in his guerrilla skills (also discussed in the movie by the anonymous GRU veteran through a comparison with Afghanistan).

If one assumes a connection with Ndrangheta,

[the] enigma of the skills, then it is easily explained by the structure of the Calabrian organization. If one was taught since his childhood, there is nothing left as to demonstrate the skills acquired before [he was] 20 years old.

There are two problems the movie is aware of. The first is that the relationship between Giuliano and the Mafia is very controversial among scholars. There are some who regard the bandit as a puppet of the Mafia, which first created and then eliminated him, and others who claim that the Mafia and Giuliano had different interests and attitudes. Slobodyanuk and Maltsev embrace the second theory.

And the sources of information that are available they say that Salvatore Giuliano had sore relations with the Sicilian Mafia.

Absolutely. They even made two attempts of assassination, thus it is hard to imagine that he was an adherent of this structure.

The second problem is that the possible connection between Sicilian bandits and representatives of the Calabrian criminal subculture is researched and suggested here for the first time. Neither media, nor scholarly research

mentioned this possible relationship. Rather, Giuliano is lionized as a truly Sicilian hero, in the tradition of the mythical (or perhaps partially real) medieval and early modern avengers, the Beati Paoli. This, however, has to do, according to Maltsev, with the mythological rather than with the real Giuliano, as

the myth of the Beati Paoli is much more stronger than the myth of Salvatore Giuliano. And everything which fits into this myth, and if you take Salvatore Giuliano and his gang, they completely correspond to the Beati Paoli. These are ones that punish rich men, unjust rich officials, and give freedom to poor, unhappy people from humiliation and oppression. Thus, we can put an equal sign between Salvatore Giuliano and the Beati Paoli, and in this case, the myth becomes of a completely different shade for the Sicilian audience.

Mystical History and Conspiracy Theories

The photographer, Samsonov, discuss in the movie how it looks strange that Giuliano, lost in the mountains and pursued by police and Carabinieri, might have supplied the media with so many quality photographs and even video footage.

It turns out that Salvatore Giuliano was actively photographed. One needs photographers to do this. There are even videos. Even videos in 1946. Which was a rarity. Quite strange. To have your own photographer at those times was a rarity. It was not the way it is now, every school child has one. It was expensive at those times. Expensive, besides, we have to keep in mind that there was poverty etc. and etc., and having a personal photographer tells a lot. One more thing which surprised me, is that photographs were made quite professionally, I mean it was not an amateur taking pictures—I would not say all, but there are some very professional photos. Very recently we have been looking at photos and hesitated if they were shots of the movie.

You mean whether they were cut from the footage?

Yes. Some of the images look as if they were staged.

Could you note that some people might have even posed?

Yes [...]

So we may assume that, in the frameworks of these shots, there is a certain propaganda machine which has an influence all over Sicily, [through] demonstration of Salvatore Giuliano's images ... "he is alive ... he was not killed ... he is ready to defend helpless ones ...". It is already an element of information propaganda or cyberwar.

Definitely.

If I am reading the situation right, we could have said that these people are knowledgeable of how to fight in a mountainous area, and these people have their own propagandistic machine, [they are] people that are capable of a certain distance management of masses in Sicily.

Entirely. At those times, in order to own such a machine one has to be very intelligent. And if this has to be propagated, not one laboratory is required but a number of them.

Plus cooperation with newspapers.

With newspapers, cooperation between cities. It is not simple.

Namely, this kind of a system has to be organized, it does not occur by itself.

No (smiles), it can't occur just on its own.

Even Sidorova, with all her sympathy for Giuliano, has some doubts on the photographs.

There was a photo of Salvatore Giuliano hiding alone in the mountains, he was sitting in the cave. At that moment there is a description in the book [by his sister] of how lonely he was, he had nobody to speak with ... I thought, well but there was somebody who took his photograph (laughs), it was not a selfie 100 % (laughs)...

The movie's conclusion is that Giuliano's mythology was socially constructed, not so much by the Sicilian collective unconscious but by a propaganda machine that went beyond Sicily.

An image of Salvatore Giuliano is created and shaped, and it was specialists who did the work. They know how it is done, as well as photographers, cameramen, and specialists in the psyche of human being as well as depth psychology.

There is no single conclusion in the movie about who these "specialists" were but Slobodyanuk in particular insist on the United States, and on how international American propaganda would have benefited from the idea that a noble Sicilian peasant-hero loved so much America and wanted Sicily to become part of it. So, in Maltsev's words, "a standard Southern Italian bandit, a common one," although admittedly gifted in several departments, was converted into a mythical hero.

The movie stops here, with the additional comment that it would probably not be wise to advertise these conclusions in Sicily and spoils what became a regional myth. However, *No Fear No Regret* does not stand alone. It is probable that the intended audience is one familiar with other videos, books, and courses of the Applied Sciences Association. In this respect, they would recognize a familiar theme of what scholars have called "conspiratoriality," a meeting point of

conspiracy theories, esotericism, and spirituality (Ward and Voas 2011). The matter is discussed elsewhere in this issue of *The Journal of CESNUR*, and I do not need to elaborate further here. In the movie, the study of Salvatore Giuliano serves as a test case for the (difficult) application to events of the past of both Fate Analysis and Applied Sciences Association's methodologies, which had been constructed by Maltsev assuming that an adequate historical analysis should involve the study of forces that prefer to operate in the shadow.

Would the Real Salvatore Giuliano Please Stand Up?

We cannot disentangle Giuliano from the media. Truths, half-truths and falsehoods were fed to the Italian and international public almost daily during Giuliano's career. Media had their own agenda, and were also manipulated by different forces.

A case in point is how the media reported that the bandit had been captured and killed by the Carabinieri. The official truth was deconstructed shortly after the incident by Italian journalist Tommaso Besozzi (1903–1964), who wrote for the weekly *L'Europeo*. It is worth nothing that, unlike daily newspapers such as the Socialist *Avanti* and the Communist *L'Unità*, which also criticized the official version, *L'Europeo* was not part of the anti-government media. It is also interesting that Besozzi's book collecting his articles (Besozzi 1959) has been republished in 2017 (Besozzi 2017), confirming the movie's idea that Giuliano is alive and well in Sicilian collective memory. The movie argues that, however amplified or distorted by mythology, Giuliano's role as a genuine, and genuinely popular, Sicilian bandit was not invented.

In reading Besozzi, we realize that the Carabinieri and the government also tried to "mythologize" Giuliano immediately after he died, but in a negative way. This is a mirror of what the movie describes, with the opposite agenda. The Carabinieri tried to demolish the image of Giuliano, pretending that, faced with capture and death, the bandit started losing his certitudes and became a normal, afraid human being. They also claimed that Giuliano was about to escape to Tunisia, and that he fell into the Carabinieri's trap because of his naïveté and vanity. The Carabinieri reported that they approached him hidden in a false press van, claiming to be journalists who wanted to interview him. In Sicily, however,

nobody believed this version, which ended up discrediting the government's press releases as a whole.

Just ten days after the announcement of Giuliano's death, Besozzi published in *L'Europeo* an article with a title that remains in the history of Italian journalism, "We only know for sure that he is dead"—although even the bandit's death was cast in doubt in the following years. Besozzi's reporting of Giuliano has recently been studied in a master thesis by Laura Mattioli. She follows Besozzi as he finds evidence that nothing of the official version is true: Giuliano was not trying to leave for Tunisia, and the famous press van did exist but did not play any role, as everybody in Montelepre knew that it was hiding the Carabinieri.

Mattioli shows how the official version was never believed in Sicily, as it ran counter both what everybody knew of Giuliano and Sicilian ethos, while it was continuously repeated by the national Italian media, whose political aim was to restore the credibility of the government compromised by its failure to stop Giuliano and other bandits. To achieve this aim, the government needed to kill not only Giuliano but his image as well (Mattioli 2003).

No Fear No Regret examines several features of the extraordinary career of Salvatore Giuliano, but not all. It is particularly interested in a psychological analysis of the bandit, and in applying to his story the Fate Analysis principles of Szondi's doctrine, as well as the methodologies created by the Applied Sciences Association, in addition to methods of investigation that are part of the science of criminology. Nor does the movie discuss in detail scholarly works about Giuliano. However, the movie's interpretation echoes the most famous academic approach to Giuliano, by British social historian Eric Hobsbawm (1917–2012). Giuliano was included in the category of "social bandits," whose prototype is Robin Hood, mythologized by the people as its real or presumed avengers (Hobsbawm 1959, 13–29), despite what the Marxist Hobsbawm sees as their "pre-political" ineffectiveness. However, according to Hobsbawm, Giuliano also "became the plaything of political forces he did not understand," which is consistent with the movie's description of the bandit's ambiguity (Hobsbawm 1959, 27).

From an Italian point of view, what is largely missing is the political angle. The one incident for which Giuliano is mentioned in Italian high school history textbooks is the massacre at Portella della Ginestra, which followed an electoral success of the Communist-Socialist front in the elections held in Sicily for the assembly that would draft the Italian Constitution.

Giuliano acted to scare and punish the Communists, and indeed he is reported to have repeated popular slogans against the “red threat.” But this went beyond his usual *modus operandi*, and somebody should have suggested the attack to him. Who did was the subject matter of a trial held in Viterbo after Giuliano’s death and of parliamentary commissions’ investigations that went on for decades.

The film, with its interplay between psychological experiment and historical research, does not present any conclusion about the forces that may have manipulated Giuliano. In Italian scholarly literature, many possible instigators have been named, including nostalgics of the monarchy (replaced by a republic in Italy in 1946), nostalgics of fascism (on whose alleged relations with Giuliano a rich literature exists: see e.g. Casarrubea and Cereghino 2009, 33–35; Casarrubea and Cereghino 2011, 79–80 and 87–93), Sicilian separatists, the strongly anti-Communist Polish Army who entered Italy at the end of World War II, Christian Democrats, and the U.S. intelligence (Höbel 2014). Giuliano himself wrote repeatedly to the Communist daily *L’Unità*, expressing his fear of being killed to prevent him to tell the truth on Portella, and alluding to Christian Democrat leaders, including the powerful Minister of Internal Affairs, Mario Scelba (1901–1991) (Höbel 2014, 133–34). Giuliano associates and the Sicilian Communists tried to implicate the leader of the Christian Democrat party in Sicily, Bernardo Mattarella (1905–1971) (Höbel 2014, 117–21), whose elder son Piersanti (1935–1980) would become governor of Sicily before being killed by the Mafia, while the younger son Sergio currently serves as the Italian President of the Republic. While all investigations exonerated Mattarella, serious clues led to local representatives of the Monarchist Party. They were, however, small operators and could only have acted with support from larger organizations. This has persuaded several scholars of the Portella incident that the U.S. intelligence was somewhat implicated.

Giuliano, one of the most wanted outlaws in Italy, was able to travel to Rome in 1947 to be interviewed by American journalist Michael Stern (1910–2009), who was at the same time an operative for the predecessor of CIA, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). Giuliano associates testified that the bandit also met Colonel Charles Poletti (1903–2002), former governor of New York and the highest ranking American intelligence officer in Italy, and that he received American weapons through officers of the Polish Army led by General Władysław Anders (1892–1970) (Höbel 2014, 123–28). In one of the later parliamentary

investigations, officers of the Italian Police (an agency different from the Carabinieri) reported that they had been stopped and beaten by American soldiers when they tried to capture Giuliano, and explained that “in case they would lose Italy [to Communism], the Americans wanted to save at least Sicily” (Camera dei Deputati 1972, 433).

Most scholars, thus, would agree with the movie that the Americans had something to do in manipulating Giuliano and creating his myth. Some also entertained the idea, presented in the movie, that his death in 1950 was a hoax. Works by independent historian Giuseppe Casarrubea (1946–2015), a high school principal whose father had been killed by Giuliano, led the Palermo prosecutors to have the bandit’s body exhumed in 2010. A DNA test concluded for a 90% likelihood that the skeleton belonged to Giuliano—but of course could not guarantee that the body exhumed in 2010 was the same buried as Giuliano in 1950 (ADN Kronos 2012).

On other items discussed in the movie, such as Giuliano’s relations with the Mafia and the Ndrangheta, the jury is still out. It is normally believed that the Mafia used Giuliano, although their relations were complicated and not clear-cut. Christian Democrat Senator Marzio Bernardinetti (1914–2008), who led the parliamentary commission who investigated Portella della Ginestra in 1969–1972, concluded that the relationship between the Mafia and bandits such as Giuliano was “permanent and systematic,” and that the *banditi* could operate and survive only with the Mafia’s permission, and be captured and killed when this permission was withdrawn (Camera dei Deputati 1972, 19–57). Bernardinetti emphasized the Mafia more than the movie, and scholars in their majority would agree with him. But not everything is clear.

Gaspere Pisciotta (1924–1954) was the man who betrayed Giuliano to the Carabinieri and was later killed with poison in the Palermo jailhouse. Contrary to what many sources report, he was not Giuliano’s first cousin: the bandit called him “cousin” to indicate that they were best friends, as it was common in Sicily (Sidoni 2010, 71). But certainly Pisciotta knew a lot about Giuliano, which made somebody decide he had better being killed in 1954. At the Viterbo trial, he explained: “We are one and the same body, bandits, the police and the Mafia. We are like the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit” (Camera dei Deputati 1972, 130–31). Perhaps Oleg Maltsev would appreciate the quote.

References

- ADN Kronos. 2012. "Italy: Unearthed Remains '90%' Likely Those of Sicilian 'Robin Hood.'" October 30. Accessed May 20, 2018. http://www1.adnkronos.com/IGN/Aki/English/CultureAndMedia/Italy-Unearthed-remains-90-likely-those-of-Sicilian-Robin-Hood_313845075768.html.
- Besozzi, Tommaso. 1959. *La vera storia del bandito Giuliano*. Milan: Vitagliano.
- Besozzi, Tommaso, 2017. *La vera storia del bandito Giuliano*. Edited by Enrico Mannucci. Milan: Milieu.
- Camera dei Deputati. 1972. *Legislatura V, Documenti–Relazioni, vol. LXIV, Doc. XXIII, n. 2-sexies*. Rome: Camera dei Deputati.
- Casarrubea, Giuseppe, and Mario José Cereghino. 2009. *Lupara nera. La guerra segreta alla democrazia in Italia 1943-1947*. Milan: Bompiani.
- Casarrubea, Giuseppe, and Mario José Cereghino. 2011. *La scomparsa di Salvatore Giuliano. Indagine su un fantasma eccellente*. Milan: Bompiani.
- Giuliano, Mariannina, and Giuseppe Sciortino. 1987. *Mio fratello Salvatore Giuliano*. Montelepre, Sicily: La Rivalosa.
- Höbel, Alexander. 2014. "La strage di Portella nelle carte della Commissione Antimafia." In *Portella della Ginestra e il processo di Viterbo: politica, memoria, uso pubblico della storia (1947-2012)*, edited by Sante Cruciani, Maria Paola Del Rossi and Manuela Claudiani, 111–36. Roma: Ediesse.
- Hosbawm, Eric. 1959. *Primitive Rebels*. Manchester: The University of Manchester Press.
- Kiss, Enikő Gyöngyösiné. 2015. "Personality and the Familial Unconscious in Szondi's Fate-Analysis." Accessed May 24, 2018. <http://www.szondi.pte.hu/document/fate-analysis.pdf>.
- Mattioli, Laura. 2003. "Tommaso Besozzi e la morte del bandito Giuliano." Master Thesis. School of Journalism, University of Milan-Bicocca.
- Puzo, Mario. 1984. *The Sicilian*. New York: Random House.
- Sidoni, Paolo. 2010. "Le fantastiche storie su Salvatore Giuliano." *Storia in rete* 59:66–75.
- Szondi, Leopold. 1953. *Mensch und Schicksal. Elemente einer dialektischen Schicksalswissenschaft (Anankologie)* (Wissenschaft und Weltbild 7). Vienna: Verlag Harold.
- Unsolved Crimes and International Schicksalsanalyse Community Research Institute. 2018. *No Fear No Regret*. Documentary movie. Odessa, Ukraine: Film Company "Status."

Ward, Charlotte, and David Voas. 2011. "The Emergence of Conspirituality."
Journal of Contemporary Religion 26(1):103–21.