

THE PRINCIPLES OF FASCISM



1921 SELECTED WORKS 1945

THE PRINCIPLES OF
FASCISM

SELECTED WORKS

1921 - 1945



TRADITION

CONTENTS

Towards the Future - <i>Benito Mussolini</i>	1
A Diary of the Will - <i>Benito Mussolini</i>	5
Response to the Zionists - <i>Benito Mussolini</i>	39
Is the White Race Dying? - <i>Benito Mussolini</i>	43
Pontine and Sardinian Thoughts - <i>Benito Mussolini</i>	49
Enough! - <i>Benito Mussolini</i>	77
Program of the National Fascist Party - <i>P.N.F.</i>	81
The Doctrine of Fascism - <i>P.N.F.</i>	95
The Catechism of Race - <i>P.N.F.</i>	115
The Political Doctrine of Fascism - <i>Alfredo Rocco</i>	121
Truth and Lies About Fascism - <i>Carlo Alberto Biggini</i>	151
My Religion - <i>Giovanni Gentile</i>	169
The Corporative State - <i>Giuseppe Bottai</i>	181
Tradition and Revolution - <i>Antonio Breuers</i>	197
Fascist Civilization - <i>Niccolò Giani</i>	203
Romanity and Latinity - <i>Massimo Scaligero</i>	209
Woman in the Fascist State - <i>Adolfo Dolmetta</i>	217
Words to the Young - <i>Ettore Muti</i>	223
Religion, Philosophy and Fascism - <i>Ugo Ciuchini</i>	225
The Holy Crusade of Civilization Against Bolshevik Barbarism - <i>Giulio de' Rossi dell'Arno</i>	231
The Jewish Problem in Italy - <i>Roberto Pavese</i>	235
Anti-Semitism - <i>Salvatore de Carlo</i>	243
Secret Societies - <i>Fermi</i>	247
Ethnic Minorities - <i>Giuseppe Cristofolini</i>	257
The Most Common Errors of European Anti-Fascism - <i>Guido Mastracchio</i>	265
Catholics and Racism - <i>Giulio de' Rossi dell'Arno</i>	271
Inside the War - <i>Indro Montanelli</i>	277
A Surprising Adaptation - <i>Roberto Farinacci</i>	281
The Concept of Race in Fascism - <i>Arturo Sabatini</i>	285
Orientations For Tomorrow: The Gold Trap - <i>Roberto Pavese</i>	293
Notes on the Fascist Doctrine of Race - <i>Pasquale Pennisi</i>	311

Towards the Future

Published in Il Popolo d'Italia, April 24, 1921

Benito Mussolini

Those who desired the destruction of Italian Fascism, and who suddenly burst with joy at the misguided thought that our destruction was imminent, have now been completely silenced. They are disappointed. They are now beginning to suspect that they went too far in their aspirations. Fascism has not been destroyed yet! There is a profound emotional-political division within the existing order which may have extreme consequences. But the masses which Fascism has collected and assembled under its wings will not "evaporate"; they may group themselves under a different name or banner or leader, but they will not longer fall prey to subversive ideologies, because the youth shuns everything cadaverous and they know that socialism—in all its various forms and subtypes on the Left and Right—is a corpse which has not yet decomposed. It may be that Fascism frees the body from unhealthy waste but preserves its unity of mass and battle. However, now is the time in which all those who have given blood and soul to the movement must assume precise responsibilities in the face of the future.

One Fascist writer addressed a fundamental problem and posed this question: must Fascism become a party? After long reflections and a careful examination of the Italian political situation, I must answer in the affirmative. Let me tell you why. The Fascist leagues are already a party, even if they repudiate this word in the traditional sense of the term. The Fascist organization—which in recent times has been greatly improved from a political point of view with the creation of provincial and regional federations—is already already a party. To reject this

word a priori would be to tie ourselves down, which is eminently contrary to the animating spirit of Fascism. On the other hand, one of the peculiar and original characteristics of Fascism has disappeared completely.

In the beginning it was truly a league; i.e. a sort of spiritual convention or political palaestra for men from different schools of thought and from different political parties. But not anymore. Except for a small nucleus of liberals and conservative nationalists, the men from the other parties have almost entirely abandoned us and returned to their old parties; and today the vast majority of the Fascist league is composed of pure Fascists. Thus it can be concluded that we have become a "party". Recent events have revealed the deficiencies of our organization in the way it was chaotically and impetuously formed. A dilemma was imposed by the very origins and course of the Fascist crisis: either it is a party or it is an army. Only in the latter case can one recognize a captain or a duce. But who is the man who can now assume personal responsibility to guide and support such a complex, rich and difficult movement? What is the Fascist movement? An army? This is a troublesome question.

In my view, the problem must be resolved in these terms: it is necessary to form a strong party so solidly framed and disciplined that it can, when necessary, turn into an army capable of acting with violence, both to attack and to defend itself. We must give a soul to the party, i.e. a program. Theoretical and practical postulates need to be revised and expanded; some of them need to be abolished. The weeks leading up to the national assembly in Rome should be and will be dedicated to elaborating the program of the Italian Fascist Party. But having soul is not enough: the party must organize itself so that it can immediately transform its members into soldiers, ready to fight violently on the battlefield against those anti-national organizations that are exalting and preparing for the advent of a regime of violence and dictatorship.

Long dissertations are not required to convince us that the present organization of the Fascist league has all the faults of a political party but none of the advantages. If we persist on this course, we will end up being an immobile aphorism, which is to say non-Fascist. Fascism is already *de facto* a party; it is useless and almost puerile to continue to refuse to recognize the exteriority of the word. The name of the party can be debated, although the name must not fail to clearly remember our origins; but there should not be any deep disagreements. This topic will have to be placed on the agenda of the congress in Rome.

A Diary of the Will

Taken from the writings of the Duce, 1927

PREFACE

Do to my passion and my fervor of understanding, I consulted many texts and I tried to find within them the great word which might give me a reason for my faith. And too often I realized what was missing in the book: The Gospel.

And then I asked if I could receive the collection of all the issues of *Il Popolo d'Italia* from its foundation up to the present. It was necessary, because nobody can live and feel Fascism without resorting to these pages in which he — the Duce — has indestructibly engraved the rules of the Regime.

Until yesterday I was missing something. But not today, and the gift overwhelms me.

It is necessary therefore to explain in a simple way the most important concepts of our political structure.

This book, which Comrade Berlutti has prepared, has very modest pretension and will appeal to the very young and to the common people.

With humility, having had recourse to unique and perfect texts and to the speeches of the Duce, Berlutti has marked in plain form answers to questions people may ask in their wise desire to understand the light of our faith in the Fatherland.

Augusto Turati
Secretary of the National Fascist Party

FASCISM: THE SALVATION OF THE FATHERLAND

When and how was Fascism born?

Fascism was born after the great war, when Italy did not obtain the peace it deserved, and the defenders were amnestied, and the heroes were scoffed at, wounded and killed. When the Communists were able to forcefully and cruelly dominate some regions of Italy, and the fields were abandoned, and the workshops deserted, and the strikes increased misery, Benito Mussolini cried - Enough! - and Italians worthy of the name gathered around him.

Was there a Government at that time?

There was no true Government: there were men who were trying to avoid certain responsibilities rather than face them. The people saw, judged, and waited for the right moment to get rid of those men.

Fascism was already born, then, among the people?

Yes. Before those few men rallied around the Duce, Fascism was in the conscience of the Nation, which recognized the danger and judged the Government incapable of saving her.

Why did the people stand with the Duce?

Because He was the expression of the Fatherland which did not want to die: He personified the sentiment of the betrayed people and the tenacious will of our Race.

There was thus a change of ministry?

In October 1922 there was a simple change of ministry, but also a profound political, moral, and social revolution.

Why did Fascism not follow the legal route and preferred revolution?

Because a new ministry alone would not solve the problem, it would only have delayed it. Only a revolution, giving full power to Fascism, could ensure the continuity of the experiment, until the goal was fully attained.

What were the early results of the advent of Fascism?

Internal disorder was replaced by a Government; indiscipline in the workshops ceased; strikes ceased; all production in the country returned to activity; the functionaries were inspired with a greater sense of duty and responsibility; and there was given a more severe and energetic course to the functions of the State, of the Provinces and of the Comunes.

What is Fascism today?

Today Fascism is a syndical movement which gathers all the productive forces of the Nation obedient to the same law and to the same idea. It is a political movement with millions of members of the same unbreakable faith. It is a military movement with a real army of Blackshirts. And everything is fused in an almost religious devotion: devotion to the Fatherland.

Is Fascism not also a party?

Yes, but it is not only a party; it is a faith which has conquered the Italian people.

Can this faith change the Italian people?

This faith will profoundly change the spirit of the Italian people: it will give them a new way of life.

What is this way of life?

To live courageously, dangerously; to feel repugnance for the comfortable and soft life; to be always ready to dare as much in the individual life as in the collective life; to love truth and abhor falsehood; to love frank sincerity and abhor that which is sneaky; to feel in every hour the pride of being Italians; to work with discipline; to respect authority.

And Fascism wants to impose this way of life?

Fascism has already imposed it in order to forge the great Italy of our poets, of our warriors, of our martyrs. Out of a population which was aging and concerned with petty interests, Fascism has made a new people which has a superb goal to reach.

In order to build Fascism, is it necessary to break down other things?

Sometimes you must break down and destroy in order to prepare the foundation for future building. Just as a builder can not build if the ground is not paved and freed from stones and thorns, so Fascism could not build if it did not destroy the old mentality, the old cliques, and the old egoistic interests.

What is the ultimate goal?

The last century was the century of our independence. This century must be the century of our power: power in all fields, from the material to the spiritual.

What will it take to reach this goal?

It only takes the soldiers of Fascism to have the will to achieve it at any cost.

HOW SOLDIERS MUST SERVE THE FASCIST IDEA

What is needed for an idea to triumph?

For an idea to triumph it needs faithful servants, disciplined soldiers, intransigent believers.

Who is a faithful servant of Fascism?

He who is not a good Fascist is not a faithful servant of Fascism; anyone who thinks that his own fortune is worth more than that of the Fatherland is not a good Fascist. On the other hand, every Fascist who considers himself a soldier even if not wearing a uniform; a soldier even when working in the office, in the workshops, on construction sites, or in the fields; a soldier bound to the rest of the army: — he who does this is a faithful servant of Fascism.

How should the discipline of the true Fascist be practiced?

The discipline of the true Fascist must be silent, active, and devout.

What does silent, active, and devout discipline mean?

It means that discipline must be in the spirit rather than in the form; which means it should not occur only during parades, but must be a feeling that animates your life.

But if we obey at the cost of sacrifice?

True, wise, holy discipline is in obeying when you do not want to, when it represents sacrifice.

And if this discipline is not accepted?

If this discipline is not accepted, it will be imposed.

We are not allowed murmurings or criticism?

Fascism banishes from its ranks quarrelsome people, those who feel a constant need to create difficulties, which they can not live without, and who sow discord and quarreling.

Even the leaders have a discipline?

Yes: discipline also helps those in command. Only obedience and being humble, but with a stern pride to obey, can achieve the right to command.

Why must we obey a Leader?

Because in the subordination of all to the will of a Leader, which is not a capricious will, but a seriously meditative will, and proven by deeds, Fascism has found its strength yesterday and will find its strength and its glory tomorrow.

To what extent should we obey the Leader?

There should be no limits. We must obey even if the Leader asks too much. If at any time the Leader of Fascism is too tough, if sometimes he is inflexible, if sometimes he seems to want to squeeze and ask for more than what is necessary, it is because he carries on his shoulders the formidable weight of the destiny of the whole Nation. True Fascists have an obligation to help him carry the heavy burden.

How must we deal with non-Fascists?

There are citizens who are not members of the party, but are honest, disciplined workers. They must be respected. There are others who seek to damage Fascism: these must be mercilessly combated.

Even with violence?

Even with violence, if it is necessary: but because Fascism is now strong and danger no longer threatens it, violence is not necessary.

And if it is necessary?

When it is necessary it should not be left to the arbitrary will of each person. In every circumstance it must not be separated from a sense of chivalry and generosity; it must always be guided by an idea and never by a low calculation.

But is violence moral?

When it is a painful necessity, when it is a surgical necessity, then violence is moral, more moral than compromising.

What kind of violence is reprehensible?

Trivial violence, brute violence, unintelligent violence, violence which has the character of a personal vendetta and not of national defense, especially violence which is ten against one.

It is to be hoped, however, that we never have to use it?

Certainly. Violence can be a tough necessity in certain specific hours of history, but every Fascist must bear in his heart the dream of a peaceful Italy, concordant, hard-working, where everyone feels they are children of the same Fatherland.

Then the Black Shirt is not a symbol of violence?

No. The Black Shirt is a symbol of ardent devotion to the Fatherland, of the spirit of sacrifice, courage and strength, but not of violence: it therefore can not be worn except by those whose hearts contain a pure faith.

Is faith enough?

Yes, if faith comes from a tenacious iron will, which does not cower in the face of obstacles.

How do you build your own will?

It is not built with cheers and cries of alalà, but with daily, bitter and painful struggle, without wanting nor asking for words of comfort.

What is the commandment of the Fascist?

Here is the commandment of the Fascist: he loves work because of the pride it gives to the individual and because of the harmony it gives to the Nation.

He lets faith always triumph over the selfish motives of self-interest, obstinacy and personalism.

He believes that every dispute and every dissension is a hindrance to the admirable order of the Leader.

He believes that every rash action is an insult to those who actually fought in the war and in the Revolution.

How must the true Fascist live?

The pure Fascist, worthy, truly a faithful servant and disciplined soldier of the idea, must be content to serve the Nation with devout humility.

THE NATION AND ITS FOUNDATIONS

What is the Nation?

Over fifty million Italians who have the same language, the same customs, the same blood, the same fate, the same interests: a moral, political and economic unity which is integrally realized in the Fascist State: that is the Nation.

Can a citizen live for himself?

Living for himself for the love of tranquility means a disinterest in the Nation for selfish purposes, and this is cowardly, and being cowardly is not Fascist. It is not possible for one to be estranged from the life of the Nation.

Why is it not possible?

It is not possible, even if you desired it, because it is not possible to deny your own mother.

What binds us to the Nation?

What binds us above all to the Nation is the feeling of being its sons, the pride of being children of this Italy which other people envy for its glorious past and its secure shining future.

Fascism also feels pride in the past?

Yes, but for Fascism it is not a pride of passivity: you have to be worthy of that grandeur, not live upon it, and not use it as degenerate sons. Some say: "We are great because we were great." No! We will be great when the past becomes an impulse, a ferment of life.

There is also an interest which binds us to the Nation?

Whatever be the fortunes of the Fatherland, a son always remains devoted; but if the Nation is peaceful, is concordant, is laborious, is prosperous and rich, it is clear that all those who are in it will benefit. Therein lies the interest which binds us to the Nation.

What is necessary for the Nation to be powerful?

You do not become powerful without internal discipline, without intelligent collaboration, rationality, all energies everyday. Only then the Nation appears as a singly army, organized, firm, serene and quiet.

Therefore we are servants of the Nation?

We must all be servants of the Nation, beginning with the Head of Government. We should have sacred pride in being devout servants.

What does the Nation ask?

Only this: the silent fulfillment of our duty.

What is this duty?

It is the duty of the son to his mother. Love her jealously, tenaciously, devotedly.

Honour her with every act of your life.

Have faith in the destiny of her, never doubting, never allowing others to doubt.

Serving faithfully, without asking, without even waiting for compensation.

Working with the proud confidence of helping her.

Defending against all enemies, within and without.

Forgiving all disgraceful brothers, except an act or a word which is hostile to the Fatherland.

Striving because the Government can fully and effectively carry out its work.

What are, according to Fascism, the foundations of the Nation?

Fascism considers as the foundations of national society the Statute, the Monarchy, the Church, the Parliament, and the Army.

What is the Statute?

The Statute is the covenant between the King and Italy signed in 1848, when Italy was formed from Piedmont, Liguria, Sardinia and Savoy.

It is thus an inviolable covenant?

Yes, under no circumstances can it be violated in what pertains to the incorruptible conquest of our Risorgimento, but it can be updated to make it, in areas where it is incomplete or deficient, more suited to our times.

Such a solemn covenant can be modified?

The legislature may modify the Statute, and has already done so for several articles which have been adapted to new needs not foreseeable in 1848.

What is the most important of these modifications?

The insertion of the Fascist Grand Council among the greatest organs of the Italian Constitution in order to regulate the relations between the supreme Sovereign, the Government,

and the Nation, thus safeguarding the inexorable developments of the Fascist Revolution.

And what is the Monarchy according to Fascism?

The monarchy is the sacred, glorious, traditional, millenary symbol of the Fatherland.

Why has the Fascist Revolution not destroyed it?

Because it represents the historical continuity of the Nation and thus fulfills a task of incalculable importance. Not only has the Fascist Revolution not destroyed the monarchy, but it has fortified it, and made it more majestic.

And was the monarchy opposed to Fascism?

The monarchy did not object and could not object, because Fascism aimed, first of all, to restore the prestige of authority. Moreover, the House of Savoy has never opposed the will of the people. And in October 1922 it permitted to enter into the worn-out arteries of the Parliamentary State the new impetuous Fascist current, fresh out of the War and exalted by the Victory.

Why is the Church considered one of the foundations of national society?

Because the Catholic religion is the sacred heritage of the people and the Church has the supreme pontiff.

What does Fascism recognize in the Church?

Fascism recognizes in the Church the supreme pontiff, its universality, its necessary freedom in religious matters, the immense moral force it exerts in the world and imposes on public life, and has the utmost respect for the Church.

Does the Church have any particular significance for Fascism?

For Fascism the Latin and imperial tradition of Rome is represented by Catholicism, which is a universal idea that radiates from Rome.

Can Fascism be non-religious?

No. Fascism is not atheistic, it is an army of believers. Religion alone makes possible the realization of great human ideals. Science tries desperately to explain the phenomena of life, but it can not explain everything; there remains always a closed wall upon which one word alone should be written: God.

And what does the Army represent for Fascism?

The Army is entitled to great respect and profound devotion: in fact it occupies a place of honour in the spirit of Italians devoted to the Fatherland.

And why in the past was it possible to vilify the Army?

Those were bastard times. If today's soldiers can carry on their chest the marks of glory from their conquest in war, if the mutilated are not forced to weep on their stumps, it is due to Fascism.

What is the role of the Army according to Fascism?

Fascism does not ask the Army anything which is not the fulfillment of its duty. The Army has only one task, the supreme task: to prepare and be ready at all times to defend the interests of the Nation.

And the task of the Militia?

The task of the Militia is to defend the Nation and the Fascist Revolution.

Is it a supplement to the Army?

No, it is not and should not be a supplement to the Army, or worse, a duplicate of the Army: its tasks are ones that the Army, by its very nature, can not bear: and tasks are limited, specific, and clearly defined, so as to avoid conflicts.

Who is the Militia composed of?

It is composed of citizens, peasants, workers, and soldiers who work all week and only present themselves when they are called. The Nation relies on their voluntary spirit.

Who controls it?

Three-quarters of the officers of the Militia are from the Army: almost all the commanders are Generals of the Army. The supreme leader is the Duce.

What are the fundamental organs of the Regime?

There are three: the Party, which is the political reservoir of the Regime, while the Guilds are the economic reservoir, and the Militia is its military safeguard.

What is the task of the Party?

The Party must Fascistize the Nation from top to bottom and from bottom to top, the Party must provide a Fascist ruling class for all major and minor institutions of the Regime.

Fascism and the Party are the same thing?

Fascism is not only a group of Italians gathered around a determined program realized and to be realized, but it is primarily a faith that has its confessors and, in jurisdictions where they operate, as militants, the New Italians. The Party is

the essential part of these systems and the role of the Party is fundamentally indispensable for the vitality of the Regime.

THE FASCIST STATE

What is the State?

The State is the political and juridical organization of National Society, and is manifested in a number of institutions of various types.

But more precisely, according to Fascism, what is the State?

According to Fascism the State is the supreme Authority which subordinates the activity and the interests of the individual citizens to the general interests of the Nation.

And the interests of the Nation coincide with the interests of the State?

Yes. The State is that unitary expression, absolute will, of the power and of the consciousness of the Nation understood as an expression of Race, and all that is within the boundaries of the Nation must be subject to the authority of the State. The State understood in this sense has not only the duty but has the right to lay down rules, the roads and the laws by which, and through which, the activity of the classes and the individuals is clearly determined.

What is the Executive Power?

It is the omnipotent power active in the life of the Nation: the power which decrees the greatest things which may occur in the

history of a people: it is the power to declare war and to conclude peace.

It is then a Sovereign Power?

This executive power, which has at its disposal all of the armed forces of the State, is the sovereign power of the Nation. The supreme head is the King.

This new conception of the State collides with old conceptions?

Yes. It strikes against the Marxist conception of the State and against the liberal conception of the State, which both rest on fundamental errors.

What is the fundamental error of Marxism?

The fundamental error of Marxism is the belief that in the State there are only two classes: the workers and the capitalists. A greater error is the belief that these two classes are in constant opposition to one another. There may be contrasts, but they are only momentary and not systematic.

With regard to class struggle, what is the difference between Marxism and Fascism?

This: that for socialists class struggle is the rule, while for Fascism class struggle is the exception; class collaboration for them is the exception, while for Fascism it is the rule.

Why can class struggle not be the rule?

Class struggle can be an episode in the life of a people, but it can not be the daily rule, because, if it were the rule, it would result in the destruction of wealth and thus in universal poverty.

Then capital and labour are not terms in opposition?

No. Capital and labour are not two terms in opposition, they are two terms that complement each other: the one can not fare without the other, and must come to an understanding.

How can they come to an understanding?

By collaborating with each other. It is in the interests of industrial workers, who are serene, to conduct a quiet life, and not be hassled by unmet needs. But it is also in the interest of the workers that production takes place with orderly rhythm, as work is the most solemn, the most noble, the most religious of life.

Does socialism recognize the legitimate rights of the workers?

Yes, but only because they believe that numbers, the masses, and quantity can create a special type of civilization in the future. Fascism, however, desires the welfare of the proletariat because it is convinced that there can be no peaceful, harmonious and strong Nation, if its workers are condemned to disadvantaged living conditions.

It is therefore just that workers want to improve their living conditions?

It is just and it is legitimate that the workers defend themselves to improve their living conditions, materially and morally. But to do so it is not necessary to follow internationalistic illusions; to do this it is not necessary to deny the Fatherland and the Nation, because it is absurd, even criminal, like a son denying his mother.

Why has Fascism fought the leaders of socialism?

If Fascism can not oppose the legitimate aspirations of the workers, then it has the duty to fight the false prophets, who,

taking advantage of the naivety and ignorance of the masses, of their real needs, of their real sufferings, blindly and brutally drive them against the Nation.

The owners of capital are not the enemies of the proletariat?

According to the socialist doctrine, the owners of capital are the torturers, the vampires of the poor proletariat. According to the Fascist doctrine, the owners of capital are modern captains of industry, among the greatest organizers, men who have and must have a high sense of civic and economic responsibility, men upon whom the fate of thousands and tens of thousands of workers depends.

And what is property?

Property is not theft, as they claim in the lowest form of socialist literature, but it is often the result of savings and hard work on the part of people who have been subjected to harsh trials; it is often private out of necessity, in order to scrape together the estate which then has the sacred right of being passed on to those who come after.

Then property is a right?

Yes, but it is not only a right, it is also a duty; it is not good to be selfish, but rather it is a good thing that you make use and develop it for the benefit of others.

What is the fundamental error of the Liberal State?

The fundamental error of the Liberal State is that of absolute neutrality in the face of collective competitions of citizens, who can fight until they strike and, consequently, annihilate the State itself.

What was the relationship between the people and the State before Fascism?

During the years of the demo-liberal regime, the working masses looked with distrust upon the State, whose authority was not beneficial to them; they were outside of the State and and therefore operated without worrying about it; they were against the State which they considered as an enemy of every day and every hour.

What position would the Liberal State take in the conflicts between capital and labour?

In face of the conflict between capital and labour, the Liberal State was pulled apart, and only when the contrast was too dangerous and overtly threatening the statal system, did it intervene and truncate the contrast by pronouncing judgment.

And the conflict was resolved?

It was not resolved, because neither party accepted arbitration, as they did not recognize the right of the State to pass judgement, but rather preoccupied themselves with escaping the will of the State.

What has replaced the old State?

The old State is now buried, it has been replaced by the national corporative State, the State which collects, controls and allocates the interests of all social classes.

Is this integral guild system possible?

Yes, but only within the realm of the State, because only the State is above the contrasting interests of individuals and of groups, and is able to coordinate them to a higher purpose. The implementation is rendered more expedient thanks to the fact

that all recognized economic organizations, guaranteed, and protected in the Corporative State, live within Fascism, and accept the doctrine and practice of Fascism.

What is the cornerstone of the Fascist State?

The cornerstone of the Fascist State is the strong State: that is, the State able to defend itself and to defend the Nation from all attacks.

Does the concept of a strong State conflict with the concept of liberty?

The concept of the Fascist State certainly strikes against the old concept of liberty, in which a citizen can do anything, even conspire against the State with impunity, vilify the institutions, and deny the Fatherland.

What is the right concept of liberty?

The concept of liberty can not be absolute, because nothing in life is absolute. Even in early barbarian society there could not be unlimited freedom, the freedom to do what you want against another individual or against the community. Even then there was a leader, a law, or simply a pact limiting the liberty of the individual.

Then the concept of liberty can be changed by historical events?

Certainly, the concept of liberty changes according to the events and the degree of civilization. There is a liberty in times of peace which can not be enjoyed in times of war, and a liberty in times of wealth which can not be enjoyed in times of poverty.

And each party invokes liberty?

Each party invokes not liberty, but their own idea of liberty. The liberty of the Communists, in fact, is not that of the

Democrats, and the liberty of the Liberals is not that of the Populars.

In any case, liberty is a right of the citizen?

In the Fascist conception, liberty is not a right of the citizen, but a duty of the citizen. It is the duty of the citizen to judge freely, work freely, and freely serve the Nation. Liberty is not a concession of the Government; it is an achievement which the citizens must place above themselves, so as to make themselves free from all other ideas, from every party in face of the Fatherland.

What liberty will Fascism never give?

If liberty means the right of suspending the daily peace and orderly labour routine of the Nation, if liberty means the right to conspire against the State, if liberty means the right to offend symbols of Religion, of the Fatherland and of the State, then this is a liberty which Fascism will never give.

What, then, is the freedom of Fascism?

That of working, that of possessing, that of publicly honouring God, that of exalting the Fatherland and its institutions, that of having consciousness of oneself and of one's own destiny, that of feeling a strong people and not a mere satellite of greed and demagoguery of others. These are the freedoms, previously compromised or lost, which Fascism has restored to the Italian people.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR

Why is labour a social duty?

Labour is a social duty because one who works effects not only his own interests, but collaborates with the interests of the Nation.

So the fortunes of the workers are connected to those of the Nation?

Yes. The fortunes of the working people are intimately linked to the fortunes of the Nation. If the Nation rises, the people also become great and rich; but if the Nation perishes, the people also die. For this reason higher social cooperation between capital and labour is indispensable.

What regulates the cooperation between capital and labour in the Fascist State?

The collaboration between capital and labour in the Corporative Fascist State is governed by the Charter of Labour.

What is the Charter of Labour?

The Charter of Labour is a type of a statute which determines the formula of the agreement which must regulate the performance of work.

Why does the Fascist State protect labour?

Because labour, in all its forms — intellectual, technical and manual — is a social duty, and as such, and only as such, the State offers its protection and discipline.

This means that the organization is obligatory?

No. The syndical or professional organization is free; but only the syndicate which is legally recognized and subject to the control of the State has the right to represent the category of employers and workers for which it is composed.

What rights are granted by being recognized?

The syndical organization recognized by the State, due to this recognition, can protect its members before the State and other professional associations, stipulate collective labour agreements, impose contributions to members, and exercise, with respect to them, delegated functions of public interest.

So the guilds are organs of the State?

The law recognizes them as organs of the State.

What are the duties of employers towards the State?

The professional associations of employers have an obligation to promote in all ways the increase and improvement of production and cost reduction.

The State intervenes in labour disputes?

It intervenes with the Magistrates of Labour, which is an organ created for this purpose: it operates when disputes are caused by breaches of contracts or new working conditions.

What has been achieved with the Charter of Labour?

After centuries of ferocious and fruitless struggles it has achieved the harmony of the various classes: solidarity among all the citizens in the face of the superior interests of the Fatherland.

THE LIFE AND THE STRENGTH OF FASCIST ITALY

Will faith, discipline, labour and production be enough to ensure the future well-being and power of Italy and the Italians?

No, everything is resting on the vitality and reproduction of the Italian people. We must remember that the primary strength of a nation, the possibility of its power and of its well-being, lies in the number of its children.

But are not the Italian people, perhaps, the most prolific?

It is not true; the truth is different and it is sad; even in Italy there is a decline in birth rates. The rate of decline is not only progressive, but it accelerates with each passing year. The deaths exceed the births. The cribs are empty, while the cemeteries expand.

How do you explain, then, that cities have become more populated?

The cities have become populated, but not for their virtue, but rather because people moved there from the rural areas. So goes the desert in the fields; but when the desert extends its plagues to the abandoned and burned, the city is taken by the throat, neither can its commerce nor its industries restore the balance which is now irreparably broken because rural households which were once prolific, took to the cities, and became sterile.

How do you make prevent the decline in births?

It has been clearly demonstrated that the sterility of the citizens is in direct relation with the disproportionate growth of the city. It is necessary for there to be favourable laws safeguarding the peasants and the workers of the fields and small towns; to reclaim all the lands which are currently unhealthy, to

make room for labour and rural life; and it is necessary to assist families which providence has blessed with many children. This is not something which the Regime plans to do; it is something which has already been done and is now being done.

And it will succeed?

It will not be impossible, because the Italian people are still capable of reacting, since their customary morality is wholesome and lively, as is their religious conscience.

And if it fails?

It would be the death of the Nation. A nation exists not only as a history and as a territory, but as a human mass which reproduces itself from generation to generation. Otherwise, it is either slavery or death. If this does not succeed, then the Fascist Revolution will fall into nothingness.

Why?

Because eventually in the fields, schools, barracks, ships, and workshops there will be no more men. But the birth rate is what will distinguish the Fascist people from other European people, as it will demonstrate our vitality and our desire to pass on this vitality through the centuries.

But will there be space and work for for millions of Italians?

The Duce says yes. In an Italy completely reclaimed, cultivated, irrigated, and disciplined, in other words a Fascist Italy, there will be space and bread for ten million more men. Sixty million Italians will make the weight of their number and their power felt in the history of the world.

What, then, is the commandment of the Duce?

To return to the land. One can not speak of national reconstruction, one can not speak of grandeur to conquer, if you do not solve the agrarian problem.

Why?

Because the greatest source of production and wealth for Italy is in the land, and the Italian citizen is, in his heart, a farmer — even when he is not using agricultural tools.

What does the agrarian problem essentially consist of?

It essentially consists of the urgent necessity of deriving from our national soil all that is necessary for the material life of the Nation; because then we can live on our own and break free from all foreign dependence.

The other governments have not studied this important problem?

The agrarian problem has always been studied by Governments, but Fascism has replaced vague desire with tenacious will, prepared to act on the long studies of the Commissions.

The agrarian problem can be solved?

It must be resolved, and will be resolved. The Duce, who has deep sympathy for the rural people, enough to qualify as a proud peasant, wants to solve it, even as a specific duty towards the peasants.

What is needed above all?

Above all it is necessary that workers remain loyal to their land, and not leave it, but become almost one with it.

How do you stop the peasants from moving away from the land?

By helping them discover that it is in their self-interest to remain peasants; by facilitating various forms of joint profit-sharing of farmlands; enabling this gradually, without sudden changes, so as not to endanger the rural economy, leading to peaceful possession of land.

The peasants deserve this intervention by the Government?

Yes. We must not forget that our peasant farmers, healthy in body and spirit, fought heroically in the war, and then later held firm in their convictions and their attachment to institutions, resisting the Bolshevik tide that threatened the Nation. They possess the most beautiful virtues of our Race and form the backbone of the Nation.

THE FATHERLAND IN THE WORLD

What are the cornerstones of Fascist foreign policy?

There are two: dignity and national utility. Fascism will never make a foreign policy which does not jealously safeguard the dignity of Italy, or does not openly defend its just interests. It follows, therefore, a policy of peace but not of suicide.

What does this mean exactly: policy of peace but not of suicide?

It means a policy which sincerely and voluntarily seeks to maintain peace, without compromising the honour and interests of the life of the Nation, refusing to bow to false ideologies.

What are these false ideologies?

It is a false ideology to say that law always triumphs over violence, that good always triumphs over evil; false ideologies are those which proclaim perpetual and universal peace, universal brotherhood of peoples, etc.

But did not the Italian people once believe in these ideologies?

Italy has believed these ideologies and has worked sincerely in their service, but the experience of peace after the war was bitter. At its own expense Italy learned that those nations which loudly proclaim these principles only do so for their own selfishness.

The League of Nations is not sufficient to guarantee justice and peace?

Let us assume that the League of Nations has the good intention of securing peace; regardless, the means available to it does not give the assurance of success.

Would a general disarmament secure peace?

No one can be opposed to all attempts of disarmament, but you must be prudent and circumspect. Fascism, which aims to look at reality most profoundly, does not believe now in the possibility of disarmament. Even if it was universal, complete, sincere, simultaneous, and controlled, it would only be a military disarmament. The warlike spirits would survive and there would remain the possibility that greater people would swallow smaller people.

Then we will have more wars?

No one can know what destiny holds for Italy. The Fascist Government sincerely wants peace, and in fact no country can boast of so many agreements and treaties of peace which, in

recent years, Italy has concluded. But desiring peace and working to maintain it does not mean denying the existence of inordinate egoism, jealousy, envy, and international rancor. Italy has a clear obligation to prepare for defense.

What does it take to be prepared?

To be prepared for all events it is necessary to train the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Militia.

That is enough?

That is not enough. It will not be possible to have a foreign policy of dignity and of firmness if the Nation does not daily demonstrate iron discipline, inside and outside the confines of politics.

Why even outside the confines of politics?

Because Italian citizens living outside the Fatherland must be the best collaborators of the Government's foreign policy.

How?

The Italians living abroad must give a daily example of honest hard work, of dignity, of fierce national pride, of civil discipline, of brotherhood beyond classes and parties, of respect for the laws of their host country; and give the best proof of the right of Italy to work for the civilization of the world. In short, the Italians abroad must be propagandists of their Fatherland, in order to maintain our prestige and facilitate our increasingly large spiritual expansion.

What does the spiritual expansion of Italy mean?

Our Italy, which has always been a mistress of civilization, must make known to other peoples the products of our spirit,

that is, our language, our art, our books, our discoveries, our inventions, our work: our civilization.

How can you sum up, then, the new foreign policy?

It comes down to this necessity which must always be present in the leaders and the people: be inexorably strong, unanimous, productive. Harmony gives prestige to the Government which speaks in the name of the people; strength sustains the prestige of the Government; productive labour liberates the Nation from others and makes the Government truly independent.

What is necessary to assure the success of all the vast work of national reconstruction?

To assure the success of all the vast work of national construction it is necessary to have the unanimous enthusiastic sacrifice of the Italian people guided and illuminated by the iron will of Benito Mussolini.

THE DUCE

Who is Benito Mussolini?

Benito Mussolini is the Duce of Fascism and Head of the Fascist Government. He is the favourite son of the renewed Fatherland: He who managed to save the Fatherland from the abyss, towards which he ran with his eyes blindfolded, and is now our guide, working to achieve superb goals worthy of the past.

Why is he the Duce of Fascism?

Because it was He who created Fascism, which is the invincible defender of the Fatherland against the bastard children and external enemies, the staunch supporter of the rights of Italy.

Why is he the Head of Government?

Because only the Duce of Fascism, who defeated the various parties which were dragging Italy to ruin, could collect the inherited misery of previous Governments and the miseries of the wicked past and reconstruct the future. He understood the people who called with a loud voice, he understood the King who entrusted him with the government of the Country.

From whom then does the power derive?

The power of Benito Mussolini derives together from the King and the People.

When was Mussolini born?

Mussolini was born in 1883. Among the politicians who lead the great nations of the world, He is the youngest and the greatest.

Where was Mussolini born?

He was born in Predappio, in the Province of Forlì; but the particular area He was born in is not important. He is a son of Italy and the whole of Italy adores him as the best of its sons.

Does he come from a noble family?

No: his father was a blacksmith who bent red-hot iron on the anvil. He himself as a child helped his father in this harsh and humble work.

Then how was he able to climb so high?

With tenacious will, tireless labour, serene confidence in his strength, and ardent love for the Fatherland and the People.

What are his ambitions?

He has no personal ambition. His only ambition is to make the Italian people strong, prosperous, grand, and free.

What is his great goal?

Making the 20th century the century of Rome, the center of Latin civilization, dominator of the Mediterranean, a beacon of light for all peoples.

Does he love the people?

He loves them jealously, but sternly: he does not attempt to flatter them with the audible rhetoric of beautiful phrases, but educates them in virile purposes: and if tomorrow it became necessary to be more stern, he would be so.

Does he love children?

Very much so. They are his most tender affection. He sees in today's children the future of the Fatherland, and desires and strives for them to be worthily prepared.

For this reason the people follow him?

For this reason the people follow him and love him, and that love is the greatest reward for his struggles.

Does the struggle tire the Government?

It is an immense struggle; but it never tires because it belongs to the race of New Italians, which is not ever dismayed, but

always proceeds fearlessly on the path laid out by destiny. The Duce himself says: "If I advance, follow me, if I retreat, kill me, if I die, avenge me!"

What is the motto of his life?

The motto of his life is that of the New Italian: "Endure and proceed".

What is the duty of Italians to Mussolini and to the Fascist Revolution?

It is contained in this: "I swear to carry out the orders of the Duce without any hesitation and to serve with all my strength and, if necessary, with my blood, the cause of the Fascist Revolution."

Response to the Zionists

Published in II Popolo di Roma, December 16, 1928

Benito Mussolini

Dear Editor,

The discussion I provoked with my article "Religion or Nation?" has garnered significant attention both inside and outside of Italy. I feel that I have a right to reply, and this is a right which I intend to make discrete use of. The letters published by your newspaper have been signed by many prominent men who can be grouped into three distinct categories:

First, the honest and sincere group, namely those Italian Jews who say that they identify as Italians, but happen to be of Jewish ancestry or religion (a similar group exists in Germany, created by Neumann), and if they had to choose between Italy or Jewry, they would choose Italy.

The second group is much less sincere: they are men who would choose Italy, but not out of any conviction or love for the Fatherland, but merely for opportunistic reasons, because they do not want to lose the high positions they occupy in the Italian world.

Finally, the last group of signatories who sent letters to your journal: this group oscillates between Nation and Religion, with a greater inclination towards Nation, i.e. the Jewish Nation. That said, we must now admit that the amount of people who have spoken up are very few in number. How many Jews are there living in Italy?

According to pre-war statistics their number was set at approximately 50,000. But these numbers are no longer accurate. After the conquest of the redeemed lands (Merano, Trieste, Gorizia and Fiume all have strong Jewish communities), in addition to the colony of Libya which has a large number of Jews, we must estimate the number of Jews to be at least 80,000 (out of a total of 42 million inhabitants). Rome alone—home to the oldest Jewish community in Europe—counts some 18 to 20 thousand Jews. Hopefully in the next census, which will be conducted in such a way as to not allow any sneaky loopholes, the true number of Jews will come to light.

Now, please read this carefully. Jewish publications boldly state that Zionism in Italy has a large following among the masses of Italian Jews. Meanwhile, it is curious to note the surprise of some Jews who pretend to have never heard of Zionism and proclaim themselves scandalized at the mere mention of the word 'Zionist'. Now, universal Zionism was born in 1897 and spread to Italy shortly after. The recent Congress of Zionists living in Italy coincided with the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Milanese Zionist Circle, chaired by the playwright Sabatino Lopez. Twenty-five local groups were represented at the Congress. The tone of their speeches is well known. Likewise the content of the posters advertised to Italian Jews. Neither of which would have moved without the intervention of this newspaper. But instead, they all would have continued to feed the movement through subscriptions, adhesions or something else. Some authors of the letters you published speak of religious fanaticism and of literature.

By no means. Italian Zionism is a vast and practical movement that has this as its supreme goal: money and the creation of a Jewish National State in Palestine through the use of intense propaganda. Just so there is no misunderstanding, they want the Palestinian State to be Jewish, just as England is English and so on. Italian Zionism is part of universal Zionism: the Italian Zionists never fail at the International Zionist Congress;

and the Zionist leaders—Weissman, Sokoloff and other minor characters—do not neglect Italian Zionism in their messages and visits.

Now, from the Italian point of view, can one consider the statement by Mr. Dante Lattes, President of the Italian Zionist Federation, published in the December 6 edition of this newspaper, as satisfactory? No. We are told of the goals of the Zionists' action in unequivocal terms that do not allow for any doubt: the goal is the establishment of a "Jewish national home in Palestine". Now a nation that is fixed in a determined territory inevitably becomes a State. And this is what the Zionists want. The British Mandate of Palestine is a covert means to this end; a Jewish State is the real goal. The preparations are obvious: from the money to the flag; from the revived Hebrew language to the cities reserved exclusively for Jews, sheltered therefore from the boogeyman of Western assimilation.

As long as Palestinian Zionism is in that phase which I will call "national preparedness", one can fairly admit that this does not necessarily disturb the legal and sentimental relations between the Jews and their fellow citizens of other countries. However, the day when Zionism enters the phase of establishing a National State, then such relationships will have to be radically revised by the governments, since one can not simultaneously belong to two Fatherlands; one can not simultaneously be a citizen of two States. As to the merits claimed by Mr. Lattes and for him by the Italian Zionists regarding the cultural and economic expansion of Italy into Palestine and in the Mediterranean, we would like to see some evidence of this (which has yet to be provided) before addressing it.

To complete this picture, let's take a look at the last issue of the newspaper of the Italian Zionists. We find on the front page in huge letters an announcement that the Haifa Bay has become the inalienable property of the "Jewish people": but the fourth page is even more interesting to read because of the controversy

that arose between Passigli, Vice-President of the Jewish the University in Florence, and the director of the newspaper, concerning the two epigraphs dedicated to the Florentine Jews who died in the last war.

The one made in 1920 says that the Florentine Jews shed their blood for "the advent of a greater Italy, and the resurgence of a free and united Israel". As you can see, it speaks of Italy, but never mentions the Fatherland. Now in 1928 the Florentine Jews wanted to clarify this and created a new plaque which no longer speaks vaguely of Italy, but explicitly speaks of the Fatherland. They changed the words to this: "The Florentine Jews died for the greatness of the Fatherland, which for us is Italy".

Analyzing the two versions, it is evident that the one made in 1928 does not lend itself to misunderstandings. So the question is, why was there so much furious anger coming from the newspaper of the Italian Zionists? Is Italy the Fatherland of the Italian Jews, or not? And if it is, then why do they get so irritated if this is engraved on a plaque dedicated to the Fallen?

Mr. Editor, by commenting on the Congress of Italian Zionists, my intention was to provoke a clarification among Italian Jews and to open the eyes of Italian Christians. The Jewish letters that you published led to a backlash in Italian newspapers. My goal has been achieved. A Jewish problem exists, and it is no longer confined to that "shadowy sphere" where it had been cleverly confined by the former, and ingenuously ignored by the latter.

Is the White Race Dying?

Published in Il Popolo d'Italia, September 4, 1934

Benito Mussolini

When in the now distant 1926, in one of my speeches, I launched the first cry of alarm about the demographic decline of the White race, a decline which also very strongly affects the Italian Nation, some people considered my warning to be untimely or exaggerated. Eight years have now passed, and the fatal decline has continued, indeed it has gotten even worse, and now there are cries of alarm arising in all parts of the world.

In Hungary, the custom of having only one-child per family is now deplored by its leaders; in the Republic of Argentina—ten times larger than Italy and where 80 to 100 million men could comfortably live—the birth rate is a massacre; the birth rate is so low, in fact, it is expected that after 1939 there will be a demographic arrest and the current population will remain at twelve million. Eminently dramatic is the appeal that twenty notable French politicians, scientists and artists have addressed to the people, to warn them about the destiny that awaits them. The manifesto says:

"The number of births has decreased in France by forty thousand units from 1932 to 1933; it fell to 682,000, while before 1870 it exceeded one million. In the near future there will also be a considerable decrease in the number of marriages, an unavoidable consequence of our past denatality, especially during wartime. For this reason alone will soon have a decrease of over 80,000 births per year. Furthermore, if the fertility of young French couples continues to decline according to the average pace of the

last six years, it is mathematically certain that France will have no more than 550,000 births in ten years.

The number of deaths will then be far superior to the number of births. Depopulation has already impoverished numerous departments, where villages are perishing and farms are falling into ruin. Allowing the declining birthrate to accentuate and extend to our whole territory means accepting that the French people will become an elderly people and means condemning France to a progressive weakening. As a result of depopulation, agriculture, trade and industry will increasingly decline due to lack of consumers. The State will become insolvent due to lack of taxpayers, and the country will be unable to defend its borders against other younger nations due to lack of defenders.

These dangers are not distant, but imminent, and the current generations are the ones who are threatened by the falling birth rate...

There is no time to waste or run for cover. Other nations have shown us the way: Germany and Italy, despite still having birth surpluses of 250,000 and 400,000 per year respectively, have already committed themselves to an energetic fight against the declining birth rate. Other measures of a moral and material nature that Germany and Italy have adopted have proved effective: at the present time, the number of their births is increasing.

France must follow their example, otherwise it will perish."

The manifesto bears the signatures of two former presidents of the Republic, namely Poincaré and Millerand, as well as Herriot, Cardinal Verdier, Marshal Foch and other great personalities.

In turn, this appeal was followed by a publication of the National Alliance, advocating the increase of the French population:

"The number of births in France has fallen by a third in the last 50 years. There were 1,034,000 births in 1868 and 722,000 in 1932. Today the fall precipitates. If this pace continues, there will be less than 500,000 births within ten years. France will lose 150,000-200,000 inhabitants each year. The aging of the population is a very serious problem. France already has the highest proportion of old people of any other nation (14%, compared to 9% in Germany and 7% in Russia). Now, the reduction in mortality can not compensate for the birth rate. France today counts 38 million French just as in 1870, but their distribution is no longer the same. There are many more elderly and far fewer children. Germany on the other hand regurgitates children and Italy has 4 million more children than France."

The practical consequences of French nationality were then reviewed. According to the National Alliance, French denatality was the fundamental cause of the 1914 war, because they made Germany believe that France was a dying nation. Finally, the publication points out the disastrous consequences of denatality, from an economic point of view, since it tends to reduce the number of consumers, as well as from a financial point of view, and finally from a social point of view. But the importance of it lies in the observation that the ten million French people born between 1870 and 1914 had created that fatal imbalance between the two population masses on both sides of the Rhine—a demographic imbalance and therefore a military imbalance—which [according to their own words], in order to fix, it was necessary to have a war and spill the blood of almost all the peoples of the earth.

When looking at Great Britain, the demographic decline truly begins to disturb the spirits. It is difficult to preserve an empire when the metropolis is old and dying.

It seems that Malthus is no longer fashionable. After all, Malthus himself did not really believe too much in his own unreasonable and catastrophic forecasts, and this is shown by the fact that he had 14 children. History demonstrates how demographic decline affects Nations. Polybius tells us how the Greek cities were sterile and empty and therefore easy prey for the Roman conquerors; but also Rome itself was plunged into catastrophe when, due to its decline in births, it had to resort to mercenary troops. There was a time in which, in order to have men tall enough for the imperial guard, they had to resort to using the Batavi (Dutch) who were conquered by Julius Caesar.

The saddest aspect of the phenomenon is the aging of the population. While in many departments of France schools are closed due to lack of schoolchildren and in other departments schools are attended mostly by foreign children (Italians, Poles, Spaniards), the financial burden for aged humanity increases every year: these are Nations where a fifty year old is an adolescent. If the phenomenon does not turn around, we can foresee a France that towards the end of the century will have a population lower than the current Spanish population. And there are European states where the birth rate is even lower than the French one. That the decline of births has no relation to the economic situation is demonstrated by the universal fact that wealth and sterility go hand in hand, while the more modest classes of the population are also the most fertile, that is to say, those who still have a sense of morality and have not massacred the divine purpose of life for the sake of cerebral selfishness.

Moreover, the last century has completely disproved Malthus' theories that the increase in population would lead to starvation due to insufficient food supplies. The world can support a population twenty times greater than the current one. The resources of the United States of America are sufficient to maintain a population five times that of today. Canada can give life to a number twenty times greater than today's inhabitants. Vast areas of South America are still almost completely

untouched; there are still others in Africa, in Australia, even in Europe, and certainly also in Asia.

The crisis we are currently facing is not a crisis of famine, as everyone now knows; on the contrary, it is precisely a crisis of overabundance due in part—as I mentioned in my speech to the Italian Chamber on May 26th—to the decrease of population in the big industrial countries.

What is even more depressing is that the so-called intellectual elements of the various nations are not prolific. They are content with one or two children, and that's if they decide to have any at all. If we look at the statistics of graduates in the various large universities and scientific institutes, we realize that, in proportion to their considerable number, the intellectuals do not understand that to a certain extent they are responsible for giving the nation new elements that can elevate its intellectual level.

This is the situation. As for the measures to be adopted, and above all the results of them, we have been quibbling for centuries: even today there are those who, for example, still argue about the effectiveness of the laws promulgated by Augustus. In one of my speeches I said that even before this terrible, delicate and mysterious phenomenon, the worst policy is the liberal one of "*laissez-faire*". No government has ever practiced this. Today, many governments have a demographic policy. In Italy we have had one since 1926. It is too early to judge the results. However, for Italy—as well as for other countries inhabited by people of the White race—it is a matter of life or death.

It is a matter of knowing whether the civilization of the white man is destined to perish in the face of the growing number of yellow and black races.

Pontine and Sardinian Thoughts

Published 1943

Benito Mussolini

1. Everything that happened had to happen, because if it did not have to happen then it would not have happened.

2. As far as gratitude is concerned, beasts are superior to men because they have instinct and not reason.

3. It seems that dictators have no alternative: they can not decline, they must fall, yet their fall does not cause any pleasure. Even when they are no longer feared, they continue to be either hated or loved.

4. What we call "life" is merely an almost imperceptible point between two eternities: the past and the future. A consoling thought!

5. Two books have greatly interested me in recent times: *The Life of Jesus Christ* by G. Ricciotti and *Giacomo Leopardi* by Saponara. Leopardi was also in a sense crucified!

6. According to Delcroix, my life should be divided into seven-year cycles marked by decisive events: 1908-1909, my expulsion from Austria; 1914-1915, intervention in the war; 1922, the March on Rome; 1929, reconciliation between Church and State; 1936, the foundation of the Empire; 1943, my fall; 1950, already dead. Finally!

7. My Pontine thoughts are over, because tonight, around one o'clock, I was woken up with the following words: "Danger in sight! We have to go!". I dressed in a hurry, collected my belongings and my papers and went to a cruiser that was waiting for me. I got on board and met Admiral Maugeri, who informed me that the new destination was the island of La Maddalena, near Sardinia.

Today [August 7, 1943] my thoughts are raised to Bruno. It is the second anniversary of his death. Under the present circumstances his death grieves me even more deeply. My dear Bruno! I have his image before my eyes as I write these words, living in a house of exile, on the second anniversary of his death.

The trip lasted twelve hours in a stormy sea. The villa I was brought to belonged to an English citizen named Weber, and is located in a strategic position. In front of it there is the sea, and beyond it, very far away, there are the jagged mountains of Sardinia. One year ago I visited La Maddalena amid the enthusiasm of the population. Today I arrive clandestinely. Who knows if today there is anyone who remembers my son and what he accomplished in his short and wonderful life.

Twenty years of work have been destroyed in a few hours. I refuse to believe that there are no more Fascists in Italy. Perhaps there are even more Fascists than before. But how bitter it is to have to see that this [coup d'état] was provoked by Fascists and carried out by card-carrying members of the Party. Fascism was an initiative that fascinated the world and indicated new ways. It is impossible that everything has collapsed. When I look back today on the tasks, achievements, work and hopes of these last twenty years I wonder: Did I dream? Was it all an illusion? Was it all superficial? Was there nothing deep?

8. A profound melancholy overwhelms me at the end of this first day of exile on La Maddalena. I feel that my son Bruno is now truly dead.

9. The memory of me and my destiny will be erased in a few years and will be completely extinguished soon after.

10. I have not read any newspaper since the morning of July 25th. It is worth noting that I do not miss them, despite being an indefatigable reader of dozens of daily newspapers.

11. The irony of destiny: from the height of power to complete unimportance, from roaring crowds to complete solitude.

12. Since October 1942 I had a continuously growing premonition of the crisis that would eventually overwhelm me. My illness greatly contributed to this.

13. In recent times, the demand for my photographs had greatly diminished and my aversion to signing them had increased equally if not more so. (I signed photos every Sunday afternoon). I felt that these photographs would be torn apart or hidden away one day. In these last days this must have happened in a "totalitarian" way in all homes. The less courageous men have torn these images, while the more courageous ones have hidden them in some closet in order to preserve them while pretending to forget them: *Sic transit gloria effigiei*.

14. We all followed with great attention the screening of the film *Sant'Elena, piccola isola* at Villa Torlonia. Thus ended the life of a very great man. Why should a much lesser man not have an equal or similar fate?

15. After fourteen days I still do not know what "I am", or rather what I have become.

16. According to Admiral Maugeri there are only twenty days a year without wind at La Maddalena. Today, August 10, 1943, is one of those days. The sea looks like a table, the trees are still.

17. Thales thanked the gods for having made him a human being and not a beast, a man and not a woman, a Greek and not a barbarian.

18. When a social or political pyramid falls, the consequences are felt even at the bottom. A small problem also arises for boys who play tennis.

19. This morning the sun is trying to break through a blanket of gray clouds rising from the east. The sea is lead-colored. The first signs of winter are in the air. In fact, my guard said: "August: the beginning of winter".

20. His name is Felice Da Nunzio and he is originally from the province of Rome. The guards at Ponza were named Torella (from Frosinone) and Tizzoni (from Rieti). There were also two officials who supervised me the first day after my arrival: Picazio (from Caserta) and Gentile (from Siracusa). I also recall Vizzini (from Palermo) and Bruni (from Teramo) who wanted my autograph.

Dictatorship is a typically Roman (republican) institution. What is called "dictatorship" in the modern world is indirect and collective dictatorship, and it seems that it can not last more than twenty years. However, we are witnessing an exception: the dictatorship of Bolshevism over the proletariat.

21. Tonight the guards fired upon hearing "suspicious" noises. This morning, August 12th, there was an air raid alarm and anti-aircraft strikes at eight o'clock. I only saw two isolated fighters flying behind the island. The whole thing lasted three or four minutes.

22. The Japanese ambassador, whom I had received again on July 15th, at the age of thirteen, must have been more surprised than anyone else by these events.

23. Mosquitoes are the loudspeakers of the night: here there are too many!

24. Even the men who make up my garrison (carabinieri and officials) must have many questions in their minds: What kind of man is he?

25. In June 1940, after the outbreak of the war, the first air-raid shelter of Villa Torlonia was built in some caves; the cellar is located near the theater. It was believed to be absolutely safe. But, after an inspection, the competent authorities declared that it was a danger. The cellars of the villa had to be strengthened. But in October 1942, after the airstrikes on Turin, Milan and Genoa, it was said that an anti-aircraft shelter had to be built that could withstand "anything", i.e. a bunker that could withstand even the heaviest bombs. Major Parisella was commissioned with the construction; the estimated cost was 240,000 lire; the duration of the work was supposed to be three months starting in December 1942. As always, in Rome, it turned out that the spot selected near the Villa was empty and had to be excavated at twice the expected depth. The work was extended and the time it took to construct got longer. It should be noted that my repulsion for the shelter increased as the work progressed, even more so as they approached the end (end of July), and not because of the cost, but because of an obscure foreboding inside me. I had the precise feeling that this air-raid shelter would be completely useless once it was finished, and that we would never use it. Indeed! One ought to listen to the voice in their subconscious.

26. For the first time since 1940 the bulletin of the Armed Forces is speaking of the enemy's activity on the ground front without mentioning our activity in the slightest. This may be interpreted as a warning to communications that our last hour has been played in Sicily.

27. A dissolved party, i.e. a prohibited party, becomes interesting for many Italians. They get pleasure out of being Fascists if by so doing they can be "subversives". A strange but despicable psychological attitude.

28. I received a second letter from Rachele without news of Vittorio. Lieutenant Faiola, who has known him since childhood, says that no harm could have come to him.

29. The best of the combatants in all the wars were also within the Party. They have mutated into authentic enemies of the State.

30. This morning Colonel Meoli's departure was reported, along with that of Lieutenant Colonel Di Lorenzo and thirty other carabinieri.

31. It is curious that in these recent times it had bored me to work in the great hall of the Palazzo Venezia. I had already decided to move to the Ministry of the Navy or to some other place in the more concentrated periphery of Palazzo Venezia, in front of the Altar of the Fatherland. A symptom of my illness.

32. The first days of a new existence—in my case as a prisoner—are really endless. Then they fill up with little things and begin to flow more quickly.

33. Today, August 13th, I was filled with a strange and continuous restlessness. Perhaps other unpleasant news. In fact,

at 5 PM I was given a bulletin of the Armed Forces which announced a second bombardment of Rome, along with the air attacks on Turin and Milan. The myth that the "Papal City" would be spared from attacks has now collapsed, along with the other legend that Rome would be bombed only because it was the seat of Fascism.

34. Has everything all gone as smoothly as they want to make us believe? How is it possible that an air force captain like Vittorio still can not give word of his whereabouts 21 days after the "change of the guard"?

35. The topics of conversation between me and my rare visitors are growing exhausted and soon we will arrive at the Trappist rule: silence.

36. I have never been interested in crossword puzzles, charades and other riddles. Today, due to the lack of books, I have been thankful to them for the possibility of killing time, before time kills me. Here everything tends toward normalization in order to endure.

37. This morning, August 14th, a man named Polito, the Inspector of Public Safety and now head of the Military Police with the rank of brigadier general, arrived on a tour of inspection. I asked him to come and see me. And he came, in fact, with Admiral Brivonesi, who took part in the conversation. This is what Polito told me:

"I accompanied Donna Rachele to La Rocca. The trip took place by car without incidents. Romano and Anna were already at La Rocca. I know nothing about Vittorio. He was at Casaro's disposition and had a leave of absence on the 26th. As far as Badoglio's promise goes, it would have been impossible to keep in his case, since there were telegrams from the Prefect, from the Quaestor and from the Commandant of the Military Zone, all of

them foreseeing grave disorders if Vittorio had gone to La Rocca. All of this was confirmed to me on the spot. It seems that the changes have been radical. Not only does one no longer see any Party insignia in Italy, but all the Fascists have not merely been dispersed: they have disappeared. Manifestos of hatred against you are innumerable. I myself saw your bust in a public toilet in Ancona. In Milan, a crowd stormed the headquarters of Il Popolo d'Italia. The staff barricaded themselves. Vito defended himself. I do not know anything more.

Many arrests have been made, but the Fascist chiefs are all free, even the much hated Starace. Count Ciano was seen in officer's uniform on the 26th. I think he went to Livorno. Grandi, Bottai and the others have disappeared from the face of the earth.

As far as the war is concerned, the people want it to end, even though they clearly know that they are in a dead end. They are now indifferent to the possibility of a defeat, which is already considered a victory in so far as they have gotten rid of Fascism and are able to breathe freely.

Your whole edifice has collapsed. Suffice it to say that today Bruno Buozzi is the head of the workers. The prefects have almost entirely been replaced by Socialists who were in hiding.

These latest air raids have been very heavy. Especially the one in Milan where the whole centre of the city, except the Cathedral, has been destroyed. The bombardment of Rome was equally harsh and hit the same quarters that had been the target of the first attack. The Pope has again abandoned the Vatican. The effects of the air-strikes on German cities have not been any better. Their victims number in the tens of thousands.

After the conquest of Sicily, the English will land in southern Italy. All the Sicilian ports are full of ships and landing craft. In Syria they are preparing another attack that will be directed

against the Dodecanese. It seems they will not try anything against Sardinia and Greece.

The war is going badly for the Germans even on land. Anglo-American air supremacy is overwhelming. Our fighters can not put up more than a ridiculously small number of aircraft against hundreds of attacking planes. It seems that the British intend to induce a complete moral and material paralysis of our country through terroristic attacks, and thereby obtain an unconditional surrender.

This war weighs more on the civilian population than on the army. It weighs on old men, women and children, and this explains the general fatigue and the hatred for the men who are responsible."

Admiral Brivonesi joined in the conversation from time to time to emphasize the speed with which Fascism had been dissolved, in such a way that would have seemed impossible just a few days earlier, although it was obvious that things had already turned sour.

General Polito advised me to keep a low profile. He asked me how I was both before and now, and added that when passions had grown calm a more just judgment would be possible because "no one can deny that your intention was to make the country great and rich". He also said: "No one informed you? Where were your close friends?"

As for the mail, the admiral said it would arrive irregularly because of the situation. He added that he would come back if I should wish it.

The talk lasted about an hour and a half. Even if we take into consideration the "coloring" which Public Safety officials give to their reports, I have come to two conclusions: 1) My system is destroyed; 2) My fall is definitive.

I would be very naive if I were surprised by the mass demonstrations. Apart from the enemies who have been waiting in the shade for twenty years, and regardless of those who have been hit, those who have been disappointed, etc., the masses have been ready in all ages to knock down yesterday's idols, even at the cost of repenting tomorrow.

But this will not happen in my case. The infallible voice of blood tells me that my star has set forever.

38. Calm August day: the sea is still, not the slightest wind. Everything under the sun seems motionless, even my destiny.

39. In the afternoon the medical colonel, director of the Military Sanitorium, Dr. Mondini of Cerea (Verona) came to see me. A nice man, cultured, a Venetian in the best sense of the word, one of those Venetians (of the Venetian province) whom I have always considered as the best stock in Italy. He prescribed me various medicines, including vitamin C injections and carbonate droplets. I asked him: "Is it still worth the trouble?" He replied: "As a man and as a doctor I say: yes." I asked Professor Frugoni the same question a few months ago and he gave the same answer. But facts proved me right. Perhaps it was not worth the trouble.

40. When a man falls together with his system, the fall is final, especially if the man is over sixty.

41. God is my witness to the desperate and agonizing attempts—I say again desperate and agonizing attempts—that I made in that fatal August 1939 to preserve peace. The efforts failed. The English and the Germans are almost equally culpable; the English for having guaranteed Poland, the Germans for having prepared a powerful military machine without having the self-control to resist the temptation to set it in motion.

42. Today, August 16th, I got the August 14th report of Radio-Navi for the first time, with news from Berlin, Tangiers, Lisbon, Madrid, Istanbul and Stockholm.

43. The military events and the fall of the Regime are linked: they are the cause and effect. It is clear that I would not be on this island today if on July 10th in the bay of Gela the Anglo-Saxons had suffered a great defeat like that of Dieppe.

44. As always, even in my fate, people want to "look for the woman". But women have never exercised the very least influence on my politics. Perhaps that has been a disadvantage. Sometimes, thanks to their fine sensibility, women can be more far-sighted than men.

45. Crispi and that complex phenomenon called "Crispism" fell in the wake of the defeat at Adua and Felice Cavallotti became extremely popular. Even then the people suddenly changed their opinion and there followed four dramatic years which found their conclusion at the end of the century in Monza Park.

46. One goes from the apex of honors, to the culminating point of capital punishment.

Of Plato's three souls the masses have the first two: the vegetative and the sentient; they lack the third, the intellective. It is not hard for me to believe that millions of Italians who glorified me up until yesterday, detest me today and curse the day I was born and the village where I was born and my whole race, perhaps even the dead, certainly the living.

47. A pope, the representative of God on earth, once called me "the man sent by Providence". That was a happy time!

48. If men always remained on the altars, then they would end up thinking of themselves as super-men or divine beings. A fall into dust leads them back to humanity, to what one may define as "elementary" humanity.

49. The more oppressive the atmosphere became, the more numerous were the proposals made to me for a reform of the internal administration. The most radical reform was that of January when I changed all the ministers except two. That resulted in a less compact, and therefore a weaker ministry than the preceding one. Defeatism among them was represented by Cini who foresaw that Italy could not resist beyond June. The effects of the reform lasted only a short time. Other internal measures, such as the appointment of new ministers for the ministries I temporarily held myself, along with the transfer of various problems to other organs, etc., should have happened after a military success, after that day which I called a "sunny day", but that day did not come.

The people waited for it, putting everything else in second place, even the equally difficult problem of food.

Even the nomination of Scorza initially aroused some interest, but then circumstances dismounted him. The speech on May 5th was too long and bleak, and lacked effect due to the loss of Tunisia. Other measures of moral, organizational or disciplinary character were little observed or not observed at all. The effect of the radio speech of July 18th was nullified by the bombardment of Rome which followed immediately after.

The people, who expected at least a halt to the enemy's advance, were not satisfied with the "points" that Scorza continued to make. Even in Fascist circles there were mild doubts about Scorza's directives, and I myself began to wonder about his loyalty. One victorious day on land, in the air, or at sea, would have consolidated the situation once again. This was demonstrated by the enthusiasm on July 10th and 11th when a

rumor spread that the landing had been repulsed. A rumor confirmed by the celebrated and shameful bulletin of July 12th, which was contradicted in a terrifying way by the bulletin of the 13th, announcing the loss of Siracusa and Augusta. The fifth act of the drama began that day. The air was poisoned by accusations and counter-accusations. There was talk of treason by the admirals, first at Pantelleria, then at Augusta.

The "twelve" who should have made speeches in the principal Italian cities were dismounted by the defeat. Scorza summoned them to the Party headquarters to examine what ought to be done. Then nearly all of them came to me and an exchange of ideas took place, which had no practical consequence apart from my decision to convene the Grand Council. Friday and Saturday were spent drawing up the Order of the Day, getting signatures and preparing the attack, or rather the maneuver. Three or four people knew what they wanted and what would happen. The others understood nothing and did not even guess that that Order of the Day would imperil the existence of the Regime.

50. Of all the so-called "totalitarian" States that arose after 1918, the Turkish one seems to be the strongest. There is a single party in that country: that of the people, whose head is the President of the Republic.

51. It is possible that some foreign commentators may have been correct about the inconstancy of the Italian people in matters of political conviction.

52. August 16th. Great agitation this morning. My blood boils.

53. Today I am thinking of three men who came from the Italian Nationalist Association and gave Fascism the great light of doctrine, fervor of faith and realization of laws: Alfredo Rocco, Enrico Corradini and Forges Davanzati.

54. Will the "shrines" of the Case del Fascio be respected? Will people still remember the men who died for Fascism, such as Costantino Marina, Oscar Tellini, Walter Vannini, Borg-Pisani and countless others?

Was there a "conspiracy" against me? Yes. Otherwise there would be no explanation for the letter that Badoglio sent me on the night of July 25-26th through General Ferone in which he spoke of a "serious" plot against my person.

Since October 24, 1942, fortune turned its back on me. The celebrations of the 20th anniversary of the March on Rome were disturbed by bombardments and enemy advance in Libya. I therefore postponed the speech I was supposed to give at the Adriano for which great preparations had been made. The speech to the Chamber on December 2nd was followed by unhappy events in Libya. On May 5th, at the last big meeting in front of the Palazzo Venezia, I said we would return to Africa, and at that moment we lost the last scrap of land on that continent in Tunisia. I reviewed the "M" Division on July 10th, the very day the enemy landed in Sicily. The first bombing of Rome occurred while I was talking to the Führer in Feltre. I will omit the list of other less characteristic blows after the change of fortune.

And yet I thought it would be pusillanimous to turn back. I hoped until the end to grab what they call the last hair on fortune's head. I hoped on July 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, and then I saw that every attempt was in vain.

My two meetings with Hitler in Venice were followed by unfortunate events.

55. August 17th. The sea looks like an alpine lake. An incredible uniformity weighs down on everything.

The past truly belongs to us. The past belongs to us with its good and its evil, its joys, its sorrows, and, according to Christian theology, not even God can abolish what has been.

I refuse to believe that they found 80 kilograms of gold in Farinacci's house. I had left Farinacci on the sidelines a bit lately because of his attitude as a Noble Father of Fascism, and because of his ostentatious Catonism.

There were two speeches in June, Delcroix's on the 5th and Gentile's on the 24th. Both were very good, but without effect because of the precipitation of military failures. And yet a bulletin even a little less displeasing than usual would have raised people's spirits again. But such bulletins grew increasingly rare.

In command of my escort is Lieutenant Taiolo from Segni in Latium, who has a brilliant military record. After being badly wounded at Tobruk he was witness to the inhuman treatment of our wounded and prisoners by the English, and since then he hates everything English. In 1935 he met Bruno and Vittorio who had volunteered at a very young age for the Air Force.

It was 8 years ago, on August 24th, that they went to Africa. Marshal Badoglio praised and promoted them. Those were the "years of sunshine" in Italian history and of the Regime: 1935-1936. It was worth living them, even if we are now surrounded by dust and rubble, and even if the authorities in Rome are not able to give me news of my son and nephew.

56. As I said in my book, Bruno's death was a favor of destiny; he would have been suffering today!

57. A voice says to me: if you were dead would not you have given up the Palazzo Venezia, the Villa Torlonia, the Rocca delle Caminate, and your relatives and friends and everything you hold dear to you? The voice does not consider that I have abandoned all this and am still alive. Yet it is as if I were dead. Eternal philosophy of the "ego".

So many died for Fascism! Will they be honored?

58. Today, August 17th, at 5 PM, the parish priest of La Maddalena, Don Capula, came to me at my request. He is Sardinian, living here for ten years, unconditionally esteemed by everyone as a priest and as an Italian. He told me he was thinking of me, and saluted me the first day he saw me on the terrace. I talked to him briefly about my problems and told him that his visits might help me overcome the grave moral crisis caused by the isolation, more than anything else. He replied that he was at my disposal and told me with great discretion: "Allow me to speak to you frankly. You have not always been great when in good fortune; so become great now in misfortune. It is from this that the world will judge you: by what you will be from this day onward, much less than by what you were up until yesterday. God, who sees all things, observes you, and I am sure that you will do nothing that could injure religious and Catholic principles, which you remember, even if new blows of fate should occur." I promised him. He will return again on Thursday afternoon. He also told me: "Many who have received your favors have forgotten you. Others feel respect for you, that kind that is due to one who has fallen, and perhaps a secret regret."

59. Lieutenant Faiola, who came from the Navy Command, told me that... [an English name; not given or not legible] told him in Rome that Eden had declared in the House of Commons that Libya would not be returned to Italy and that British Radio has accused Badoglio of "following in Mussolini's footsteps". And the same Radio also announced the occupation of Messina. August 17th closes with this sad news.

60. A month ago at Riccione I saw Romano, Anna, Guido and Adria for the last time. I arrived there at 7 PM. We all listened to Scorza's speech together, it was the last substantially good speech, but delivered in a uniform tone, monotonous and with almost despairing accents.

61. In the following lines I want to document the behavior of Dino Grandi, Count of Mordano, from the beginning of 1943 until the month of July. It may be of interest.

His attitude seemed clear until the end of February. But after the ministerial crisis it grew ambiguous. In some circles they called him "the fence-sitter". In other circles he was undoubtedly regarded as a friend of the English. This latter accusation was unjustified. At that time Grandi was often absent from Rome, staying instead in Bologna where he had bought the newspaper *Il Resto del Carlino*. Beyond that he had also purchased an industrial complex tied up with it, worth several million. At the beginning of March he asked me for an interview and wanted me to propose him for the Order of the Annunziata. He justified his request on the grounds of having been ambassador in London for many years and of having been President of the Chamber. I promised that I would speak to the King, and did so at one of the two weekly audiences that the Sovereign granted me every Monday and Thursday. His Majesty told me that the first reason advanced by Grandi was not sufficient but that the second was. As to the occasion, His Majesty said it could take place at the Feast of the Annunciation, which occurs on March 25th. And so it happened. The newspapers published the item without long comments. The President of the Senate, excluded from this honor, suffered from it as a loss of prestige.

At the beginning of April (the exact date can be found in the register of audiences that I kept strictly in order) I saw Grandi again and he thanked me with an effusion of words, literally saying to me: "Before meeting you I was a reporter for *Il Carlino*, a modest journalist. I am your creation. I owe everything to you, I owe you everything I have become in life. My devotion to you is unlimited, allow me therefore to tell you that I love you."

Was he sincere? In that moment I think he was, yes. I mentioned the services he rendered as an ambassador, as Minister of Foreign Affairs and as a Fascist. He went back to Bologna. I

saw him again on May 5th in the Palazzo Venezia after Scorza's speech at the Adriano. He appeared radiant: "Duce. What a noble speech. We have all rediscovered ourselves. We have returned to the old atmosphere. We have found the right path", etc. Then he went back to Bologna and the accusations that he was a "fence-sitter" grew stronger again.

At the end of June he was in Ferrara for Scorza's commemoration of Balbo. Upon his return, Scorza said that Grandi did not want to take his place in the orator's tribune and had behaved all day with a reserved attitude. (While in London Grandi had violently slandered Balbo, even as to his personal courage.)

Now we come to July. During the week from the 11th to the 18th, Scorza chose twelve representatives of the Regime to speak in the main Italian cities. Grandi was also among those chosen. He telegraphed the Party and asked to be excused. Scorza repeated his request through the Federal Secretary. But the Federal Secretary telegraphed that Grandi absolutely refused to speak. Scorza wanted to take disciplinary measures against Grandi. I advised him not to and recommended he not make a "case" against Grandi at that moment.

Since Grandi in one of his letters to Scorza had mentioned the necessity of a "sacred union", I summoned Grandi and asked him what "sacred union" he meant; if, in other words, he was thinking of reviving the old parties which I had suppressed and bringing back their leaders. He told me he was thinking of a "sacred union" of all Italians to remove the party character from the war. "It is time", he said, "to have them stop saying this is Mussolini's war. This is everybody's war. It is time for the Crown to come out of its reserve. Our national territory has suffered an invasion and the Crown does not speak. The Crown avoids its duty. It ought to assume its responsibility. This is also and above all Vittorio Emanuele III's war. The country wants the Crown to

come out of its reserved attitude and have the war assume its national character."

I explained to him that two parties grow up in all wars; those who want the war and those who do not want it. The war of 1915-18 was called the "interventionists' war". Today's war is called the Fascists' war. A sacred union between opposing elements is impossible. French attempts prove this. In France, at a given moment, Clemenceau rose above the "sacred union". The conversation was carried on in a cordial manner. But I had the distinct feeling that the man was already on the other side. He was already on the other side of the barricade.

Scorza spoke on the evening of July 18th. The following day, Grandi telegraphed Scorza from Bologna: "Your speech was magnificent; that is how the great men of the Risorgimento used to speak", etc.

In a later conversation—I do not recall the exact date, but it occurred at the start of the week of July 18th to the 25th—Grandi told me that Scorza also had "disappointed him and no longer pleased him". On Thursday and Friday he returned and begged me not to convene the Grand Council, yet at that same moment his "plan" was already decided. According to the last part of his Order of the Day, Grandi wanted to force the Crown to make a decision. Either the Crown would have accepted and thereby assumed responsibility for the war, or it would not have accepted and thereby demonstrated its weakness. The Crown chose the first alternative in this dilemma, with all that resulted from doing so, concerning which I do not, at this moment, wish to offer any consideration. At the Grand Council Grandi declared that this Order of the Day would remain secret. But in the morning all of Rome knew of it and had a feeling that something big was happening.

62. Since I am writing of the past, of the men who were close to me, I will also speak of Bottai, who is a valiant soldier and a

keen writer. But all that he begins remains unfinished. As a politician he is restless, but also courageous. He is probably of mixed blood. His face is rather a mask. His gaze is often elusive and unclear as to the end. Enriched? It is said so, yes. He is not very popular. At the meeting of the old Fascists in Rome on April 21st he was booed, or almost booed.

When he left the ministry for which he had drawn up the "Schools Charter", he slammed the door behind him. A month later he came to me and said: "I can not go on doing nothing. I propose the following solutions: either Bevione's job at the National Insurance Institute, or Giordani's at the IRI, or an embassy temporarily." I replied: "You are not qualified to take Bevione's place, which he has a right to hold until June 15th. It seems like you got yourself into a quiet corner with 200,000 lire a year. As ex-minister of Corporations you are more suited to the IRI. But even starting with the fact that Ciordani has expressed no intention of retiring, too many billions are at stake. I prefer to look into the possibility of giving you an embassy, Berlin for example, where Alfieri has really exhausted himself."

He agreed. After a couple of months he came to me again and told me he had found another solution, namely the presidency of the Chamber, in view of the imminent end of the session. I replied that I preferred this solution to all the others, provided that Grandi would agree. Shortly thereafter Bottai came to me again with a short letter from Grandi in which the latter said he was happy that Bottai had been chosen as his successor. The rest is known.

63. In my life I have never had a "friend" and I have often asked myself whether this was an advantage or a disadvantage. Today I maintain it has been a good thing. In this way, many people are spared from "pitying me", that is, from "suffering with me".

64. I wonder if the memorials of Bruno are still on display and honored in the War Museum of Milan.

65. Albini, an error and a disappointment! Ugly in face and in soul. He knew everything and told me nothing.

66. On the morning of July 25th Bastianini called me to tell me that Goering wanted to come to Italy for my 60th birthday. I replied that it would be good. On the 30th Goering sent me a telegram, which was brought to Ponza by a major of the Carabinieri. I translate it as documentation:

"Duce! Since circumstances have not permitted me to personally bring you my good wishes as intended, I send them to you with this letter for your birthday, together with my deepest esteem. Moved by the feeling of sincere friendship and unconditional loyalty, I feel the need to thank you for the friendly reception which you have so often and so amicably given me in the past, and for the manifestations of unalterable friendship. My wife and I send you our best wishes for your personal well-being on your birthday. May the strength and personality of Your Excellency be used in the future for the benefit of the combatants of the European nations, despite the harsh trials and grave events of this epoch. As tangible evidence of my esteem, I send you a bust of Frederick the Great. With immutable comradeship and with the deepest and most cordial esteem and the sense of my unconditional loyalty, I remain your devoted Goering, Imperial Marshal of the Greater German Reich."

This telegram has convinced me even more that Goering is a friend of Italy. I would have liked to reply to him, but have not done so because I did not want to give a necessarily banal response to such a moving and fraternal telegram.

67. So this will be my juridical position: ex-head of Government, in protective custody from the fury of the populace!

68. August 17th (1937 or 1938?): flight from Rome to Pantelleria and back.

69. It is difficult to measure the severity of the psychological trauma with which the young people of the Italian Youth of the Littorio (GIL) were struck on the night of July 25-26th. The trauma must have been especially hard on the male Academy of the Farnesina and on the female branch in Orvieto, as well as on the pre-military institutes of the Army in Brindisi, Venice, Forlì and Bolzano, which were organizations with perfect discipline and which had reported great successes. These young people were admired by nearly all the European nations; they had put on unforgettable sporting and gymnastic events, and the Young Fascist Division gave splendid proofs of its military valor from Bir el Gobi to Mareth; they deserved to be treated with greater respect. This youth, which has suffered this unforeseen shock: where will they go tomorrow? To the left? Toward extremist ideas? Or, distrustful and disappointed, believe in nothing and in no one?

70. A marshal, a certain Daini from Ciociaria, came back from the peninsula and I talked to him for a little while. He is a frank individual, of modest intellectual gifts, and therefore his words have a certain basis. He said there is a strengthening of the subversive movement. The people are discouraged and want only one thing: to end the war at any cost. The villages of Latium are full of "displaced people from Rome".

71. Among the modest men who have served me I want to mention two of them: Ridolfi and Navarra. The first rode beside me every morning for almost twenty years. He was a

conscientious fencing master and riding master, non-calculating, faithful in the true sense of the word. I wonder if they have arrested him? Navarra was my first usher for twenty years, well-educated, discreet, respectful and also non-calculating.

I want to say a word of praise also for my chauffeur Boratto, who risked his life by driving me during the assassination attempts. With the exception of a dog he struck in Montefiascone, he never had an accident despite being forced to speed.

72. After naming the men, why not also remember the animals? They also had a place in my life. The names of my horses: Rusovitch, Ziburoff, Ned, Thiene, Eron (a gift from Dolfuss). And the dogs: Carlot (very ugly but very intelligent); Bruno's dog was named Bar. In Riccione he laid for several days in front of the room where Bruno's belongings were. The loyalty of an animal!

73. August 19th. My passion week, if I may be permitted to call it that, began exactly a month ago with my meeting with the Führer in Feltre. The meeting should have lasted four days like the earlier one in Salzburg. Feltre had been chosen for security reasons and because of its proximity to the border. The date was not fixed. Because of the events in Sicily, July 19th was chosen, and the duration of the meeting was determined in one day. Too short to examine the situation in general or in detail. The bureaucracy insisted on Feltre, although the meeting could very well have taken place in the Prefecture of Treviso, thus saving four hours. Bureaucracy is not capable of this intellectual gymnastic. I started the flight at 7 AM, on the morning of the 19th from Riccione, and punctually arrived at Treviso Airport at 8:30. I found the usual assembly of officials and aviators, fairly grey. Shortly thereafter some German airplanes arrived with officers from the Führer's entourage, among them Marshal Keitel.

The Führer arrived at 9:00 precisely. He reviewed the unit and then we headed toward the station. We took the train and about an hour later arrived at Feltre. From there we continued by car to the villa chosen for the meeting, Senator Gaggia's villa, a labyrinth of halls and smaller rooms, the memory of which is a nightmare. We arrived after another hour in an open car under a burning sun, and during the ride I exchanged a few words of no importance with the Führer.

The talk started at 12:00. Keitel, General Warlimont and other German officers were present, along with Ambassador Mackensen; on the Italian side there was General Ambrosio and his interpreter, Bastianini and Alfieri. The Führer spoke first and talked for two hours. His words were stenographed and the complete text of the speech can be found in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He had hardly begun to speak when my secretary came into the room and handed me a note from Rome with the following contents: "Rome is being heavily bombed; it began at eleven o'clock." I communicated the news to the Führer and to those present. The atmosphere grew oppressive and sad, and became even more sad later after telephone communications informed us of the exceptionally long duration of the attack, of the great number of aircraft and of the very serious damage done to the University and the Church of San Lorenzo.

After the Führer's statements, our first exchange of opinions between the two of us took place: 1) the submarine war would be resumed with new means; 2) at the end of August a retaliatory air fleet would start operations against London, which would be wiped off the face of the earth in a week.

I told him, among other things, that while awaiting these reprisals, Italy's the defense ought to be strengthened in every way. I was again called and more news was communicated to me; in the meantime the hour of departure arrived. It was only during the hour passed in the train that I told him plainly that

during this time Italy had to support the total weight of two empires like Great Britain and the United States, and that we risked being crushed under that weight, and that the bombardments of cities not only shook the people's morale but severely damaged the war production and gravely disturbed the whole social life of the country. I told him once again that the African campaign would have gone differently if we had not air superiority, but at least an air force equal to that of the enemy. I said moreover that the spiritual tension inside the country had become great and dangerous. He told me that the Italian crisis was a crisis of direction, and that he would send further air reinforcements and new divisions for the defense of the peninsula. He declared that Italy's defense is of maximum interest for Germany as well. The tone of the talk was always very friendly and we parted in a comradely manner. Then the Führer's plane took off. While I was accompanying Keitel to his plane, I said to him: "Send everything we need and send it right away; keep in mind that we are in the same boat!"

At 6 PM I flew directly to Rome. I slowed down over Monte Soratte and noticed a great cloud on the horizon. It was the smoke from the burning of the Littorio Station, which I flew over a few minutes later. Hundreds of railway cars were burning, walls were destroyed, the airport was unusable. The situation was the same at the locomotive depot and in the district of San Lorenzo. The damage seemed enormous. The prefect and some other people were present at my landing. I went to Villa Torlonia. On the way I met a number of people heading for the countryside on foot and with every possible means of locomotion. The city looked gloomy. Long queues of people crowded around the fountains as the water mains were broken. That evening, from Villa Torlonia, the glow of the fires could still be seen in the sky. Rome had lived a frightening day of iron and fire, which had destroyed every illusion and created a situation full of uncertainties.

In the following days I visited some of the most heavily-damaged places, especially the airport and Littorio Station, the Ciampino Airport and the Città Universitaria, but I gave orders not to discuss this in the newspapers.

In the meantime the enemies of the Regime had spread rumors that the meeting at Feltre had been fruitless, that Germany was abandoning us, and that after the conquest of Sicily the English would land in Rome almost without opposition. All these rumors increased the nervous tension which was already close to collapse. The same state of mind dominated the Court. This was confirmed to me during my penultimate conversation with the King. The last one took place at Villa Savoia on the 25th.

74. This morning, August 19th, Admiral Brivonesi, whom I had most anxiously awaited, returned from Rome and broke my isolation by bringing me a letter from my wife dated August 13th. My wife told me that she also is practically isolated, has no telephone, and lives in a constant state of alarm. I do not know if this is because of air raids or for other reasons. The admiral also brought me a large box containing the complete works of Nietzsche, marvelously bound. These are 24 volumes sent to me by the Führer for my 60th birthday, through Marshal Kesselring. Lastly, Admiral Brivonesi told me, in a letter sent to me by Lieutenant Faiola, that Vittorio had gone abroad and been declared a deserter, which caused me great pain; he said that Vito was at La Rocca and has not been able to get to Mercato Saraceno, which might mean that the authority of the new Regime in Romagna is dubious; and he said that *Il Popolo d'Italia* is no longer being published in Milan. Personal documents and books from Palazzo Venezia will be handed over to me. Nothing new as to my personal position.

75. Here ends the first notebook of "Pontine and Sardinian Thoughts".

August 19, 1943, at 3 PM.

Enough!

Published in Corrispondenza Repubblicana, April 17, 1944

Benito Mussolini

With the assassination of Giovanni Gentile, the picture was completed. Every social category is now represented in the long list of dead: from the six-year-old child to the hardworking laborer, from the loyal squadrist to the young recruit, from the silent soldier to the ardent officer of the Decima MAS, from the patriotic priest to the capable federal official—none have been spared; all have been shot by assassins in pay of the enemy. Therefore it is time to shout "enough!" to such havoc and to say a few clear words to the Italians here and beyond the Garigliano Line. First of all this bloodshed must absolutely cease, this anarchy must end, it must be fought and suppressed, and the guilty must be executed without mercy.

The usual right-thinking person might wonder why such incidents do not take place in that part of Italy under Allied occupation. The answer is simple: because even Fascists would not resort to killing Count Sforza, or the carabinieri serving on the Bari-Brindisi railway line, or Francesco Musotto, High Commissioner for Sicily, who is the father of a heroic sailor. It is not our custom to hire Italians to cowardly assassinate other Italians from behind. We do not regard ourselves as enemies of the Neapolitans or the people of Bari who do their duty to maintain a bit of order, in order to alleviate the already many sufferings of the Italian people. We are not anti-Italian. Because it is no longer a question of Fascism: Giovanni Gentile was not killed only because he was a Fascist; he was murdered because he was Italian, and his assassin is not an Italian patriot.

It is time for the Italian people to stop believing that the "Allied" nations are waging war only on Fascism, which, moreover, they claim is dead and buried: they are waging war, plain and simple; everything else is system, propaganda and clever political moves.

Were the several thousand people killed in Treviso all Fascists? Furthermore, the unfortunate month of August 1943 should cause one to pause and think. Badoglio was leading the government, the Fascists were in prison; yet the bombings not only continued but in fact increased in a bloody rhythm never before seen.

They want to conquer Italy and enslave it, plain and simple, and instead having to witness Italy's rebirth is extremely unpleasant to those who approach the sixth year of war and who now realize that there will be no overwhelming victory as the Allies proclaimed.

Italy already suffers the pains of hell without the need for Italians to butcher each other, especially when this struggle only works to the advantage of the foreigner.

When a ship carrying all of us runs the serious danger of sinking, is it reasonable for the crew, rather than uniting to save the salvageable and prevent the sinking, instead argues over possession of the lifeboats and lets everyone sink into the sea?

Let me say to those of you who are listening: the only lifeboat that remains is the one that bears the name of Mussolini. He saved us once; why not believe or at least hope that he can save us a second time?

Some of you say or think that the war can no longer be won and that it was an error or a mistake to have declared it. There are a thousand valid arguments which prove to you that the war could not be avoided. But even granting that the monarchical war has been lost because of the betrayal, why not believe we can still impact or even win the republican war, the war of the

people? After centuries of dismemberment, only Mussolini provided Italy with a backbone. Since July 25th the nation belongs again to an order of spineless men, men without a backbone.

You must realize that the only one in Italy who can stand up and deal on an equal footing with Hitler, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin is still Mussolini and only Mussolini. Certainly not the House of Savoy or Badoglio, who are puppets kept standing for a political game. If for the moment the Allied press does not cover them with insults, there is no doubt that the judgment of British or neutral historians will certainly not be kind to these two men. Badoglio and Savoy will become synonyms for traitors; and not only this, but the Italian people themselves, each of us will be placed in the same category and the dishonorable poison of contempt will be spit upon us by all languages, as is already happening.

The treacherous blow which struck the Italian people on September 8th was mortal; only the presence of Mussolini has prevented the dagger from reaching the heart. It is no mystery what would have happened without him. Would the bombings have ceased? No. Would this war which is today defined as a "martyrdom" be over? No. The Germans and the English would still be fighting as they are now. It is true that the Government of the Italian Social Republic calls the classes to arms (even Badoglio has done so), imposes new laws and enforces them, by force if necessary, and condemns those citizens who are guilty of crimes against the Fatherland. But do the Italian people want to delude themselves into thinking that they can stand by and watch while the whole world is upside down?

Party considerations do not matter, because today every Italian worthy of the name can not have any program other than that of saving Italy from definitive catastrophe. But do the other parties have real men? The old and new debutants in the Neapolitan theater are full of compromise and their action is

flawed due to its prejudicial roots; the one and only thing which holds them together is anti-Fascism. They boast with hypothetical certainty that they are on the side of the victor; but this is far from decided. This is a war of the unexpected and the unpredictable.

Italians, enough! He who kills a Fascist kills an Italian, therefore he is an enemy of Italy. Instead, you should collaborate with those who are trying to rebuild a common home, and work conscientiously and with firm commitment. You young people must present yourselves to the barracks; do not force the authorities to spill more blood. What do you fear? It is better to endure military discipline than to continue to live hidden at home or even in the mountains like the brigands of the past. In doing so, you do not cover yourself in glory, but rather you become only bandits or idiots. You workers and laborers: think of work, here or elsewhere, without worrying about whether it is Fascist work or National Socialist work; it is simply work and only work, and for this you will never suffer any boredom or reprisal. As for you so-called bourgeois, listen less to Radio London and more to your Italian heart, which, you can be certain, will not let you down.

Today all of our lives are at stake, and complaining is of no use. By collaborating with true Italians here or beyond the Garigliano, we can stall for time and bring the tempo down from *agitato* to *andantino*, perhaps *con brio*, but without suddenly planting knives into each other's backs and shortening the life of the purest Italians, who do not want anything other than what the best fighters all want: to save the honor, independence and future of the Fatherland.

Program of the National Fascist Party

Published 1921

FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS

Fascism constituted itself as a political party in order to strengthen its discipline and to individuate its beliefs.

The Nation is not reducible to a sum total of living individuals, nor is it a tool that political parties may use for their own ends. Rather, it is an organism comprising an indefinite series of generations of which single individuals are but transient elements. The Nation is the supreme synthesis of all the material and immaterial values of a race.

The State is the juridical embodiment of a Nation. Political institutions are effective as long as the Nation's values are expressed and protected by them.

Autonomous values upheld by individuals, like the collective values upheld by multitudes and espoused by organized collective bodies such as families, municipalities, guilds and so on, ought to be promoted, developed and defended. But this must always be done within the Nation, an entity to which these values are subordinate.

The National Fascist Party maintains that the form of social organization predominant in today's world is the national society. It holds, moreover, that the destiny that awaits global life is not the unification of various societies into a single, global society, i.e. "humanity" in the parlance of the internationalists. Rather, destiny promises something better: fruitful and peaceful competition among all national societies.

THE STATE

The State must be reduced to its essential functions: maintaining the political and judicial order.

The State bestows powers and responsibilities on associations. It also grants professional and economic guilds the right to vote in elections to the National Technical Councils.

It therefore follows that the powers and duties currently assigned to the Parliament must be restricted. Under the Parliament's sway come all problems of the individual as a citizen of the State, and of the State as an organ whose purpose consists in realizing and protecting the supreme national interest. Under the National Technical Councils' sway come all problems involving the activities undertaken by individuals as producers.

The State is sovereign. Such sovereignty cannot and ought not be damaged or diminished by the Church, to which ample freedom must be granted so that it may carry out its spiritual ministry.

The National Fascist Party's attitude regarding the forms assumed by individual political institutions depends upon the moral and material interests of the Nation, understood both in its reality and in its historical becoming.

THE GUILDS

The rise of guilds (*corporazioni*) is a historical fact that Fascism cannot oppose. It aims at coordinating corporative development in the pursuit of national objectives.

Guilds must be promoted with two functional goals in mind: as an expression of national solidarity and as a means for the development of production.

Guilds must not strive to submerge the individual in the collectivity by arbitrarily leveling his or her abilities and strengths. Rather, they must aim at making good use of and developing them.

The National Fascist Party will advocate the following positions in support of blue-collar and white-collar workers:

1. The enactment of a State law establishing an official standard workday of eight hours for all employees, with possible exceptions being granted due to special agricultural or industrial needs;
2. The enactment of welfare legislation adapted to current needs—particularly in the domains of accident, disability, and old-age protections for agricultural, industrial, or office workers—so long as it does not hamper production;
3. Obligatory representation of workers in the management of factories, limited with respect to personal issues;
4. The management of industry and public services be entrusted to union organizations that are morally and technically up to the task;
5. Promotion of the diffusion of small landholdings in those regions where it makes sense for certain types of agricultural production.

CORNERSTONES OF DOMESTIC POLICY

The National Fascist Party aims to bring a new dignity to our political habits, so that the life of the Nation is not characterized by antithetical forms of public and private morality.

It aspires to the supreme honor of governing the Nation and aims to restore the ethical principle that governments ought to administer the commonwealth as a function of the Nation's supreme interest and not as a function of the interests of political parties and cliques.

The prestige of the nation-state must be restored. The State in question does not look with indifference upon the outbreak of arrogant forces attempting or threatening to materially and spiritually weaken its structure. It is a jealous keeper, defender and propagator of national tradition, sentiment and will.

The freedom of individual citizens is subject to a twofold limit: the freedom of other juridical persons and the sovereign right of the Nation to live and develop.

The State must favour the Nation's growth by promoting (but not monopolizing) all efforts that foster the ethical, intellectual, religious, artistic, judicial, social, economic and physiological development of the national collectivity.

CORNERSTONES OF FOREIGN POLICY

Italy must reaffirm its right to complete its historical and geographical unity, even in cases where unity has not yet been fully achieved. It must fulfill its duty as a bulwark of Latin civilization in the Mediterranean basin. It must firmly and

serenely assert the sway of its laws over the peoples of different nationalities annexed to Italy. It must provide real protection to Italians abroad, Italians who are deserving of the right to political representation.

Fascism finds the founding principles of the so-called League of Nations wanting, because irrespective of whether they are members or non-members, nations do not enjoy an equal footing within the League.

Fascism does not believe in the vigour or effectiveness of the color-coded internationals, whether red, white or other. The latter are artificial, formal constructions gathering small minorities of individuals with varying degrees of conviction. They are to be contrasted with the great masses of the population whose lives, whether on an upward or downward trajectory, provoke shifts in powers and, in turn, the collapse of all international constructions. Recent history has proven as much.

The diffusion of Italianism (Italianità) throughout the world must be the aim of Italy's commercial growth and of the international treaties through which it asserts its influence. International treaties must be reviewed and altered, particularly where they contain clauses that are clearly inapplicable; they must fulfill the needs of the national and worldwide economy.

The State must make the most of Italian colonies in the Mediterranean and overseas by means of economic and cultural institutions, as well as by developing rapid international and transportation links.

The National Fascist Party openly supports a policy of friendly contact with the peoples of the Near and Far East.

The defense and growth of Italy abroad must be placed in the hands of an army and navy that are equal to Italy's political needs and on par with the armies and navies of other nations. It must also be placed in the hands of a diplomatic corps that, aware of its role, is endowed with culture, courage, and the

requisite skills necessary to express Italy's greatness at once materially and symbolically.

CORNERSTONES OF FISCAL POLICY AND POLITICS

The National Fascist Party will insist upon the following:

1. That concrete sanctions be imposed on individuals and guilds when labour contracts that were freely entered into are not respected;
2. That, in cases of acts of negligence, public employees and their supervisors be subject to civil sanctions to the benefit of the injured party;
3. That taxable income and assessments of inherited estates be made public, in order to facilitate the monitoring of each citizen's financial obligations to the State;
4. That all future State initiatives that aim to protect certain branches of agriculture and manufacturing from dangerous foreign competition be designed as a stimulus to our Nation's productive forces and not for the benefit of parasitic, plutocratic groups whose intention it is to exploit our national economy.

The following will be the short-term objectives of the National Fascist Party:

1. Balancing State and local budgets (when necessary) by means of rigorous cutbacks to all parasitic or redundant entities via reductions in expenditures neither crucial to the well-being of the beneficiaries nor justified by more general objectives;

2. Decentralization of the public administration so as to simplify the delivery services and to streamline our bureaucracy, without falling into the trap of political regionalism (which we most firmly oppose);
3. Shielding the taxpayers' money from misuse by means of abolition of all State or local government concessions and subventions to consortia, cooperatives, factories, special clientele and other entities similarly incapable of surviving on their own and not indispensable to the Nation;
4. Simplifying the tax code and distributing tax burdens according to proportional criteria (that do not amount to "proportional plundering") such that no category of citizens is unduly favoured or handicapped;
5. Opposition to financial and fiscal demagoguery that hampers the spirit of enterprise and saps our Nation's savings and production;
6. Cessation of policies favouring public works projects that are botched, undertaken for electoral reasons, or supposedly to ensure law and order, projects that are unprofitable because of the irregular fragmentary way in which they are distributed;
7. Crafting of an organic public works plan in harmony with the Nation's new economic, technical and military needs. The plan proposes:
 - a. Completion and reorganization of the Italian railway system, so as to ensure better links between newly liberated regions and the peninsula and to improve transportation links within the peninsula itself, especially north-south links across the Apennines;
 - b. Maximum acceleration of the electrification of railways and, more generally, the exploitation of

hydroelectric power in our mountainous river basins so as to promote the growth of industry and agriculture;

- c. Repair and expansion of the roadway system, especially in the South, where this is a necessary precondition for resolving countless economic and social problems;
 - d. Creation and reinforcement of maritime links between the Italian peninsula and the islands, the eastern Adriatic shore and our Mediterranean colonies, as well as between the North and South, so as to shore up the railroads and/or to encourage Italians to take to the sea;
 - e. Concentrating expenses and efforts in a few key harbors on the three seas surrounding the peninsula outfitting them with the most up-to-date equipment;
 - f. Struggle and resistance against all forms of localism [only] inasmuch as, in the field of public works, they lead to uncoordinated efforts and thwart projects of national interest.
8. Return to the private sector of industries that the State has managed poorly, in particular, the telephone system and the railroads. Regarding the latter, competition needs to be enhanced between the major lines, which need, in turn, to be managed differentially with respect to regional and local lines;
9. Abolition of the State monopoly on postal and telegraphic communications so that private enterprise may supplement and eventually replace the State-run service.

CORNERSTONES OF SOCIAL POLICY

Fascism recognizes the social function of private property. At once a right and a duty, private property is the form of management that society has traditionally granted individuals so that they may increase the overall patrimony.

In the face of socialist reconstruction based on a prejudicially collectivist model of economics, the National Fascist Party has its feet firmly planted in the soil of our historical and national reality, which does not allow for a single type of agricultural or industrial economy, but favours any and every solution, be it individualistic or of any other kind, that will guarantee the maximum level of production and highest well-being.

The National Fascist Party advocates a regime that would strive to increase our national wealth by unleashing individual enterprises and energies—the most powerful industrious factor in economic production—and by abolishing, once and for all, the rusty, costly and unproductive machinery of State-based, society-based and municipality-based control. The party thus supports all efforts to enhance Italy's productivity and to eliminate forms of individual and group parasitism.

The National Fascist Party will argue for the following:

1. That disorderly clashes between divergent class and socio-economic interests be disciplined, to which end it is essential that organizations representing workers and employers be granted legal recognition (so that they may, in turn, be made legally responsible);
2. That a law be promulgated and strictly enforced prohibiting strikes on the part of public servants. Moreover, arbitration boards must be set up that are made up of representatives from the executive, from

among the blue-collar or white-collar workers on strike, and from the taxpayers.

SCHOOL POLICY

The schools' overall objective ought to be the shaping of individuals who can contribute to the Nation's economic and historical progress, the raising of the masses' moral and cultural level, and a continual renewal of the ruling elite via the training of the best elements within every social class.

To these ends, the following measures are urgently needed:

1. Reinforcement of the battle against illiteracy through the building of schools and access roads and by means of all State measures that may be deemed appropriate;
2. Mandating that compulsory schooling extend through the sixth grade in municipalities where schools are available and can accommodate all students who do not continue on to middle school after the sixth-year exam. In all other municipalities, mandatory schooling at least through the fourth grade;
3. The institution of rigorous national elementary schools whose task it is to physically and morally shape Italy's future soldiers. In order to carry out this mandate, intensive State monitoring of programs, teacher selection and teacher performance are necessary (especially in municipalities in the hands of anti-nationalist forces);
4. Free middle schools and universities, although State monitoring of academic programs and of the spirit of what is being taught is required, as is the State's direct

involvement in pre-military instruction, aimed at facilitating the training of officers;

5. Teacher-training colleges governed by the same principles that govern the schools where teachers will be employed. Therefore, schools training elementary school teachers must retain a rigorous national character;
6. Development of a master plan for the establishment of professional, industrial and agrarian schools that would make use of funding and a wealth of experience provided by manufacturers and farmers. These schools would have as their purpose an increase in the Nation's productivity and the training of an intermediate class of technicians, between workers and managers. To this end, the State will have to supplement and coordinate existing private sector efforts, while displacing these where they are found wanting;
7. Endowing middle and high schools with an overall "classic" character. All types of middle schools should be unified, so that Latin is studied by all students. French must no longer be the only language studied alongside Italian. The second modern language ought to be chosen as a function of regional need, especially in those areas that border on other nations;
8. Centralization of all educational benefits, grants and so on, under the aegis of a single institute managed by the State. Such an institute would single out the most intelligent and hardest-working pupils in the earliest grades and ensure that they go on into higher education. It would counteract (when necessary) parental selfishness and provide needy students with substantial financial aid;
9. Improvement of the salary and status of teachers, professors and army officers (who are, after all, the Nation's military educators). This should provide them

with increased respect and with the means to expand their cultural horizons. It will also inspire in them and in the general public a higher awareness of the national importance of their mission.

JUSTICE

Preventative and therapeutic anti-crime methods must be promoted such as reform schools, schools for the deranged, criminal asylums, and the like. Penal sentences are a means of self-defense on the part of a national society whose laws have been violated. They are usually meant to have both intimidatory and corrective value. From the standpoint of the second, it is essential that the hygiene of jails be improved and that, via the introduction of prison work, their social function be perfected. Special tribunals should be abolished.

The National Fascist Party is in favour of a reform of the military criminal code.

Trial proceedings ought to be swift.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Every citizen is obliged to serve in the military. Our army must start to see itself integrated within a single armed Nation, a Nation within which all individual, collective, economic, industrial and agricultural forces converge for the supreme purpose of defending our national interests.

To this end the National Fascist Party advocates the immediate creation of a complete and perfect army, an army that watches over newly conquered borders like a vigilant sentry and that, on the domestic front, makes sure that the Nation's infinite reserve of spirits, men, and military means is always trained, organized and regimented so that it is always ready for times of danger and glory.

With this same goal in mind, the army, along with schools and sports clubs, must infuse citizens' bodies and spirits with the aptitude and knowledge required for battle and sacrifice in the name of the Fatherland (pre-military instruction).

ORGANIZATION

Fascism in action is an organism with goals that are:

- a. political
- b. economic
- c. combative.

In the political field, Fascism opposes sectarianism. It welcomes any person sincerely espousing its principles and obeying its discipline. It stimulates and values those endowed with genius, gathering them together in expert groups according to their specialty. It participates intensely and regularly in all aspects of political life, putting into contingent practice that which does not lie outside its doctrine's pragmatic framework, while at the same time reaffirming the doctrine as an overarching whole.

In the economic field, Fascism supports the creation of professional guilds which, depending upon historical or

geographical circumstance, may be either genuinely Fascist or independent in character. Only one thing is crucial: that they be deeply informed by the tenet that the Nation stands above all social classes.

As concerns the bellicose character, the National Fascist Party is one and the same as its squads. The squads are voluntary militias fighting in service of the nation-state. They are a living source of strength in which and through which the Fascist idea embodies itself and defends itself.

The Doctrine of Fascism

Published 1932

FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS

1. Like all sound political conceptions, Fascism is action and it is thought; action in which doctrine is immanent, and doctrine which, arising out of a given system of historical forces, remains embedded in them and works on them from within. Therefore it has a form correlative to the contingencies of time and space; but it also has an ideal content of thought which elevates it to an expression of truth in the higher level of the history of thought. One does not act spiritually as a human will dominating the will of others in the world without a conception of the transient and particular reality under which it is necessary to act, and of the permanent and universal reality in which the first has its being and its life. In order to know men one must know man; and in order to know man one must know reality and its laws. There can be no conception of the State which is not fundamentally a conception of life: philosophy or intuition, a system of ideas developing logically or gathered within a vision or a faith, but which is always, at least virtually, an organic conception of the world.

2. Thus many of the practical expressions of Fascism such as a party organization, a system of education, and discipline, can only be understood when considered in light of its general attitude toward life. A spiritual attitude. Fascism sees in the world not only those superficial, material aspects in which man appears as an individual separated from all others, standing by himself, and governed by a natural law which instinctively urges

him toward a life of selfish momentary pleasure. The man of Fascism is an individual who is nation and fatherland, which is a moral law, binding together individuals and generations into a tradition and a mission, suppressing the instinct for a life closed within a brief circle of pleasure, in order to restore the duty of a higher life free from the limits of time and space: a life in which the individual, through self-denial, through sacrifice of his own private interests, through death itself, realizes that completely spiritual existence in which his value as a man lies.

3. Therefore it is a spiritual conception, arising from the general reaction of this century against the flabby and materialistic positivism of the nineteenth century. Anti-positivistic, but positive: not skeptical, nor agnostic, nor pessimistic, nor passively optimistic, as are, in general, the doctrines (all negative) which place the center of life outside man, who by his free will can and must create his own world. Fascism wants man to be active and to engage in action with all his energies; it wants him to be manfully aware of the difficulties that exist and ready to face them. It conceives of life as a struggle, considering that it behooves man to acquire for himself that life truly worthy of him, creating first of all in himself the instrument (physical, moral, intellectual) to construct it. As for the individual, so for the nation, and so for humanity. Hence the high value of culture in all its forms (artistic, religious, scientific) and the great importance of education. Hence also the essential value of work, with which man conquers nature and creates the human world (economic, political, moral, and intellectual).

4. This positive conception of life is obviously an ethical one. It invests the whole field of reality, as well as the human activities which master it. No action is exempt from moral judgment; there is nothing in the world which can be stripped of the value which belongs to everything in its relation to moral ends. Life, therefore, as conceived by the Fascist, is serious, austere, and

religious; all its manifestations are poised in a world sustained by moral forces and subject to spiritual responsibilities. The Fascist disdains the "comfortable" life.

5. The Fascist conception of life is a religious one, in which man is viewed in his immanent relation to a higher law, endowed with an objective will which transcends the particular individual and raises him to conscious membership of a spiritual society. Those who see nothing but mere opportunistic considerations in the religious policy of the Fascist regime fail to realize that Fascism is not only a system of government, but also, and above all, a system of thought.

6. In the Fascist conception of history, man is what he is only in light of the spiritual process to which he contributes as a member of the family, the social group, the nation, and in function of history to which all nations bring their contribution. Hence the great value of tradition in memories, in language, in customs, in the rules of social life. Outside history man is nothing. Fascism is therefore opposed to all individualistic abstractions based on eighteenth century materialism; and it is opposed to all Jacobinistic utopias and innovations. It does not believe in the possibility of "happiness" on earth as conceived by the economic literature of the eighteenth century, and it therefore rejects the teleological notion that at some future time humanity will secure a final settlement of all its difficulties. This notion runs counter to experience which teaches that life constantly flows and changes. Politically, Fascism desires to be a realistic doctrine; practically, it aims to deal only with those problems which are the spontaneous product of historic conditions and which find or suggest their own solutions. In order to act among men, as in the natural world, it is necessary to enter into the process of reality and to take possession of the already operating forces.

7. Anti-individualistic, the Fascist conception is for the State; and it is for the individual only in so far as he coincides with the State, which is the conscience and universal will of man in his historical existence. It is opposed to classical liberalism, which arose as a reaction to absolutism and exhausted its historical function when the State was transformed into the conscience and will of the people. Liberalism denied the State in the interest of the particular individual; Fascism reasserts the State as the true reality of the individual. And if liberty is to be the attribute of real men, and not of abstract puppets invented by individualistic liberalism, then Fascism is for liberty, and for the only liberty which can be real, the liberty of the State and of the individual within the State. Therefore, for the Fascist, everything is in the State, and outside of it nothing human or spiritual can exist, much less have value. In this sense Fascism is totalitarian, and the Fascist State—the synthesis and unity of all values—interprets, develops, and potentiates the whole life of the people.

8. Outside the State there can be neither individuals nor groups (political parties, associations, syndicates, classes). Therefore Fascism is opposed to Socialism, which confines the movement of history to the class struggle and ignores the unity of classes established in a single economic and moral reality in the State. Fascism is likewise opposed to classist syndicalism. But when brought within the orbit of the State, Fascism recognizes the real needs which gave rise to socialism and syndicalism, giving them purpose within the guild or corporative system in which divergent interests are coordinated and reconciled in the unity of the State.

9. Individuals form classes according to the similarity of their interests, they form syndicates according to differentiated economic activities within these interests; but first and foremost they form the State, which is not to be thought of numerically as the sum-total of individuals forming the majority of a people.

Fascism is therefore opposed to democracy, which equates a nation to the majority, lowering it to the level of the largest number; but it is the purest form of democracy if the people are conceived, as they should be, from the point of view of quality rather than quantity, as an idea, as the most powerful idea (most powerful because most moral, most coherent, most true) which acts within the nation as the conscience and the will of a few, even of One, and as an ideal tends to become active within the conscience and the will of all; that is to say, of the whole group ethnically molded by natural and historical conditions into a nation, following the same line of development and spiritual formation as one conscience and one sole will. Not merely a race, nor a geographically determined region, but a people joined together by common blood, historically perpetuating itself, unified by an idea and imbued with the will to live, the will to power, self-consciousness, personality.

10. This higher personality is the nation in so far as it is the State. It is not the nation that generates the State, as according to the old naturalistic concept which served as the basis of the political theories of the nation-states of the nineteenth century. Rather the nation is created by the State, which gives to the people, conscious of their moral unity, a will and therefore an effective existence. The right of a nation to independence derives not from a literary and ideal consciousness of its own being, still less from a more or less unconscious and inert acceptance of a de facto situation, but from an active consciousness, from a political will in action and ready to demonstrate its own rights: that is to say from a state already coming into being. The State, in fact, as the universal ethical will, is the creator of the right to national independence.

11. A nation, as expressed in the State, is a living, ethical entity only in so far as it is progressive. Inactivity is death. Therefore the State is not only Authority which governs and

confers legal form and spiritual value on individual wills, but it is also Power which makes its will felt and respected beyond its own frontiers, thus affording practical proof of the universal character of the decisions necessary to ensure its development. This implies organization and expansion, potential if not actual. Thus the State equates itself to the will of man, whose development cannot be checked by obstacles and which, by achieving self-expression, demonstrates its infinity.

12. The Fascist State, as a higher and more powerful expression of personality, is a force, but a spiritual one. It sums up all the manifestations of the moral and intellectual life of man. Its functions cannot therefore be limited to those of enforcing order and keeping the peace, as the liberal doctrine had it. It is no mere mechanical device for defining the sphere within which the individual may duly exercise his supposed rights. The Fascist State is an inwardly accepted standard and rule of conduct, a discipline of the whole person; it permeates the will no less than the intellect. It stands for a principle which becomes the central motive of man as a member of civilized society, sinking deep down into his personality; it dwells in the heart of the man of action and of the thinker, of the artist and of the man of science: soul of the soul.

13. Fascism, in short, is not only a law-giver and a founder of institutions, but an educator and a promoter of spiritual life. It wants to remake, not the forms of human life, but its content—man, his character, and his faith. And to this end it requires discipline and authority that can enter into the spirits of men and there govern unopposed. Its sign, therefore, is the Lictors' rods (*fascio littorio*), the symbol of unity, strength, and justice.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL DOCTRINE

1. When in the now distant March of 1919, speaking through the columns of the *Popolo d'Italia* I summoned to Milan the surviving interventionists who had intervened, and who had followed me ever since the foundation of the *Fasci d'Azione Rivoluzionaria* in January 1915, I had in mind no specific doctrinal program. The only doctrine of which I had practical experience was that of socialism, from until the winter of 1914—nearly a decade. My experience was that both of a follower and a leader but it was not doctrinal experience. My doctrine during that period had been the doctrine of action. A uniform, universally accepted doctrine of Socialism had not existed since 1905, when the revisionist movement, headed by Bernstein, arose in Germany, countered by the formation, in the see-saw of tendencies, of a left revolutionary movement which in Italy never quitted the field of phrases, whereas, in the case of Russian socialism, it became the prelude to Bolshevism.

Reformism, revolutionism, centrism, the very echo of that terminology is dead, while in the great river of Fascism one can trace currents which had their source in Sorel, Peguy, Lagardelle of the *Mouvement Socialiste*, and in the cohort of Italian syndicalists who from 1904 to 1914 brought a new note into the Italian socialist environment—previously emasculated and chloroformed by fornicating with Giolitti's party—a note sounded in Olivetti's *Pagine Libere*, Orano's *Lupa*, Enrico Leone's *Divenire Sociale*.

When the war ended in 1919 Socialism, as a doctrine, was already dead; it continued to exist only as a grudge, especially in Italy where its only chance lay in inciting to reprisals against the men who had willed the war and who were to be made to pay for it.

The Popolo d'Italia described itself in its subtitle as the daily organ of fighters and producers. The word producer was already the expression of a mental trend. Fascism was not the nursling of a doctrine previously drafted at a desk; it was born of the need of action, and was action; it was not a party but, in the first two years, an anti-party and a movement. The name I gave the organization fixed its character.

Yet if anyone cares to reread the now crumpled sheets of those days giving an account of the meeting at which the Fasci Italiani di Combattimento were founded, he will find not a doctrine but a series of pointers, forecasts, hints which, when freed from the inevitable matrix of contingencies, were to develop in a few years time into a series of doctrinal positions entitling Fascism to rank as a political doctrine differing from all others, past or present.

"If the bourgeoisie"—I then said—"believe that they have found in us their lightening-conductors, they are mistaken. We must go towards the people... We wish the working classes to accustom themselves to the responsibilities of management so that they may realize that it is no easy matter to run a business... We will fight both technical and spiritual rear-guardism... Now that the succession of the regime is open we must not be fainthearted. We must rush forward; if the present regime is to be superseded we must take its place. The right of succession is ours, for we urged the country to enter the war and we led it to victory... The existing forms of political representation cannot satisfy us; we want direct representation of the several interests... It may be objected that this program implies a return to the guilds. No matter! I therefore hope this assembly will accept the economic claims advanced by national syndicalism..."

Is it not strange that from the very first day, at Piazza San Sepolcro, the word 'guild' (*corporazione*) was pronounced, a

word which, as the Revolution developed, was to express one of the basic legislative and social creations of the regime?

2. The years preceding the March on Rome cover a period during which the need of action forbade delay and careful doctrinal elaborations. Fighting was going on in the towns and villages. There were discussions but there was something more sacred and more important:—death. Fascists knew how to die. A doctrine—fully elaborated, divided up into chapters and paragraphs with annotations, may have been lacking, but it was replaced by something far more decisive,—by a faith. All the same, if with the help of books, articles, resolutions passed at congresses, major and minor speeches, anyone should care to revive the memory of those days, he will find, provided he knows how to seek and select, that the doctrinal foundations were laid while the battle was still raging. Indeed, it was during those years that Fascist thought armed, refined itself, and proceeded ahead with its organization. The problems of the individual and the State; the problems of authority and liberty; political, social, and more especially national problems were discussed; the conflict with liberal, democratic, socialistic, Masonic doctrines and with those of the Partito Popolare, was carried on at the same time as the "punitive expeditions". Nevertheless, the lack of a formal system was used by disingenuous adversaries as an argument for proclaiming Fascism incapable of elaborating a doctrine at the very time when that doctrine was being formulated—no matter how tumultuously,—first, as is the case with all new ideas, in the guise of violent dogmatic negations; then in the more positive guise of constructive theories, subsequently incorporated, in 1926, 1927, and 1928, in the laws and institutions of the regime.

Fascism is now clearly defined not only as a regime but as a doctrine. This means that Fascism, exercising its critical faculties on itself and on others, has studied from its own special standpoint and judged by its own standards all the problems

affecting the material and intellectual interests now causing such grave anxiety to the nations of the world, and is ready to deal with them by its own policies.

3. First of all, as regards the future development of mankind, and quite apart from all present political considerations, Fascism does not, generally speaking, believe in the possibility or utility of perpetual peace. It therefore discards pacifism as a cloak for cowardly supine renunciation in contradistinction to self-sacrifice. War alone keys up all human energies to their maximum tension and sets the seal of nobility on those peoples who have the courage to face it. All other tests are substitutes which never place a man face to face with himself before the alternative of life or death. Therefore all doctrines which postulate peace at all costs are incompatible with Fascism. Equally foreign to the spirit of Fascism, even if accepted as useful in meeting special political situations—are all internationalistic or League superstructures which, as history shows, crumble to the ground whenever the heart of nations is deeply stirred by sentimental, idealistic or practical considerations. Fascism carries this anti-pacifistic attitude into the life of the individual. "I do not care" (*me ne frego*)—the proud motto of the fighting squads scrawled by a wounded man on his bandages, is not only an act of philosophic stoicism, it sums up a doctrine which is not merely political: it is evidence of a fighting spirit which accepts all risks. It signifies new style of Italian life. The Fascist accepts and loves life; he rejects and despises suicide as cowardly. Life as he understands it means duty, elevation, conquest; life must be lofty and full, it must be lived for oneself but above all for others, both near by and far off, present and future.

4. The population policy of the regime is the consequence of these premises. The Fascist loves his neighbour, but the word 'neighbour' does not stand for some vague and unseizable conception. Love of one's neighbour does not exclude necessary educational severity; still less does it exclude differentiation and

rank. Fascism will have nothing to do with universal embraces; as a member of the community of nations it looks other peoples straight in the eyes; it is vigilant and on its guard; it follows others in all their manifestations and notes any changes in their interests; and it does not allow itself to be deceived by mutable and fallacious appearances.

5. Such a conception of life makes Fascism the resolute negation of the doctrine underlying so-called scientific and Marxian socialism, the doctrine of historic materialism which would explain the history of mankind in terms of the class struggle and by changes in the processes and instruments of production, to the exclusion of all else.

That the vicissitudes of economic life—discoveries of raw materials, new technical processes, and scientific inventions—have their importance, no one denies; but that they suffice to explain human history to the exclusion of other factors is absurd. Fascism believes now and always in sanctity and heroism, that is to say in acts in which no economic motive—remote or immediate—is at work. Having denied historic materialism, which sees in men mere puppets on the surface of history, appearing and disappearing on the crest of the waves while in the depths the real directing forces move and work, Fascism also denies the immutable and irreparable character of the class struggle which is the natural outcome of this economic conception of history; above all it denies that the class struggle is the preponderating agent in social transformations. Having thus struck a blow at socialism in the two main points of its doctrine, all that remains of it is the sentimental aspiration—old as humanity itself—toward social relations in which the sufferings and sorrows of the humbler folk will be alleviated. But here again Fascism rejects the economic interpretation of felicity as something to be secured socialistically, almost automatically, at a given stage of economic evolution when all will be assured a maximum of material comfort. Fascism denies the materialistic

conception of happiness as a possibility, and abandons it to the economists of the mid-eighteenth century. This means that Fascism denies the equation: well-being = happiness, which sees in men mere animals, content when they can feed and fatten, thus reducing them to a vegetative existence pure and simple.

6. After socialism, Fascism trains its guns on the whole block of democratic ideologies, and rejects both their premises and their practical applications and implements. Fascism denies that numbers, as such, can be the determining factor in human society; it denies the right of numbers to govern by means of periodical consultations; it asserts the irremediable and fertile and beneficent inequality of men who cannot be leveled by any such mechanical and extrinsic device as universal suffrage. Democratic regimes may be described as those under which the people are, from time to time, deluded into the belief that they exercise sovereignty, while all the time real sovereignty resides in and is exercised by other and sometimes irresponsible and secret forces. Democracy is a kingless regime infested by many kings who are sometimes more exclusive, tyrannical, and destructive than one, even if he be a tyrant. This explains why Fascism—although, for contingent reasons, it was republican in tendency prior to 1922—abandoned that stand before the March on Rome, convinced that the political form of the State is no longer a matter of preeminent importance, and because the study of past and present monarchies and past and present republics shows that neither monarchy nor republic can be judged *sub specie aeternitatis*, but are forms in which is expressed the political evolution, the history, the traditions, and the psychology of a given country.

Fascism has outgrown the dilemma: monarchy vs. republic, over which democratic regimes too long dallied, attributing all insufficiencies to the former and praising the latter as a regime of perfection, whereas experience teaches that some republics are

inherently reactionary and absolutist while some monarchies accept the most daring political and social experiments.

7. In one of his philosophic Meditations, Renan—who had pre-fascist intuitions—remarks, "Reason and science are the products of mankind, but it is chimerical to seek reason directly for the people and through the people. It is not essential to the existence of reason that all should be familiar with it; and even if all had to be initiated, this could not be achieved through democracy which seems fated to lead to the extinction of all arduous forms of culture and all highest forms of learning. The maxim that exists only for the well-being and freedom of the individuals composing it does not seem to be in conformity with nature's plans, which care only for the species and seem ready to sacrifice the individual. It is much to be feared that the last word of democracy thus understood (and let me hasten to add that it is susceptible of a different interpretation) would be a form of society in which a degenerate mass would have no thought beyond that of enjoying the ignoble pleasures of the vulgar."

In rejecting democracy Fascism rejects the absurd conventional lie of political equalitarianism, the habit of collective irresponsibility, the myth of felicity and indefinite progress. But if democracy be understood as meaning a regime in which the masses are not driven back to the margin of the State, then the writer of these pages has already defined Fascism as an "organized, centralized, authoritarian democracy".

8. Fascism is definitely and absolutely opposed to the doctrines of liberalism, both in the political and the economic sphere. The importance of liberalism in the 19th century should not be exaggerated for present day polemical purposes, nor should we make of one of the many doctrines which flourished in that century a religion for mankind for the present and for all time to come. Liberalism really flourished for fifteen years only. It arose in 1830 as a reaction to the Holy Alliance which tried to

force Europe to recede further back than 1789; it touched its zenith in 1848 when even Pope Pius IX was a liberal. Its decline began immediately after that year. If 1848 was a year of light and poetry, 1849 was a year of darkness and tragedy. The Roman Republic was killed by a sister republic, that of France. In that same year Marx, in his famous Communist Manifesto, launched the gospel of socialism.

In 1851 Napoleon III made his illiberal coup d'etat and ruled France until 1870 when he was turned out by a popular rising following one of the severest military defeats known to history. The victor was Bismarck who never even knew the whereabouts of liberalism and its prophets. It is symptomatic that throughout the 19th century the religion of liberalism was completely unknown to so highly civilized a people as the Germans but for one parenthesis which has been described as the "ridiculous parliament of Frankfort" which lasted just one season. Germany attained her national unity outside liberalism and in opposition to liberalism, a doctrine which seems foreign to the German temperament, essentially monarchical, whereas liberalism is the historic and logical path to anarchy. The three stages in the making of German unity were the three wars of 1864, 1866, and 1870, led by such "liberals" as Moltke and Bismarck. And in the upbuilding of Italian Unification liberalism played a very minor part when compared to the contribution made by Mazzini and Garibaldi who were not liberals. But for the intervention of the illiberal Napoleon III we should not have had Lombardy, and without that of the illiberal Bismarck at Sadowa and at Sedan very probably we should not have had Venetia in 1866 and in 1870 we should not have entered Rome. The years going from 1870 to 1915 cover a period which marked, even in the opinion of the high priests of the new creed, the twilight of their religion, attacked by decadentism in literature and by activism in practice. Activism: that is to say nationalism, futurism, fascism.

The liberal century, after piling up innumerable Gordian Knots, tried to cut them with the sword of the world war. Never

has any religion claimed so cruel a sacrifice. Were the gods of liberalism thirsting for blood?

Now liberalism is preparing to close the doors of its temples, deserted by the peoples who feel that the agnosticism it professed in the sphere of economics and the indifferentism of which it has given proof in the sphere of politics and morals, would lead the world to ruin in the future as they have done in the past.

This explains why all the political experiments of our day are anti-liberal, and it is supremely ridiculous to endeavor on this account to put them outside the pale of history, as though history were a preserve set aside for liberalism and its adepts; as though liberalism were the last word in civilization beyond which no one can go.

9. The Fascist repudiations of socialism, democracy, liberalism, should not, however, be interpreted as implying a desire to drive the world backwards to positions occupied prior to 1789, a year commonly referred to as that which opened the demo-liberal century. History does not travel backwards. The Fascist doctrine has not taken De Maistre as its prophet. Monarchical absolutism is of the past, and so is theocracy (ecclesiolatria). Dead and done for are feudal privileges and the division of society into closed, uncommunicating castes. Neither has the Fascist conception of authority anything in common with that of a police ridden State.

A party governing a nation "totalitarianly" is a new departure in history. There are no points of reference nor of comparison. From beneath the ruins of liberal, socialist, and democratic doctrines, Fascism extracts those elements which are still vital. It preserves what may be described as "the acquired facts" of history; it rejects all else. That is to say, it rejects the idea of a doctrine suited to all times and to all people. Granted that the 19th century was the century of socialism, liberalism, democracy, this does not mean that the 20th century must also be the

century of socialism, liberalism, democracy. Political doctrines pass; nations remain. We are free to believe that this is the century of authority, a century tending to the "right", a Fascist century. If the 19th century was the century of the individual (liberalism means individualism) we are free to believe that this is the "collective" century, and therefore the century of the State. It is quite logical for a new doctrine to make use of the still vital elements of other doctrines. No doctrine was ever born quite new and bright and unheard of. No doctrine can boast absolute originality. It is always connected, if only historically, with those which preceded it and those which will follow it. Thus the scientific socialism of Marx links up to the utopian socialism of the Fouriers, the Owens, the Saint-Simons; thus the liberalism of the 19th century traces its origin back to the illuministic movement of the 18th century, and the doctrines of democracy to those of the Encyclopedistes. All doctrines aim at directing the activities of men towards a given objective; but these activities in their turn react on the doctrine, modifying and adjusting it to new needs, or outstripping it. A doctrine must therefore be a vital act and not a verbal display. Hence the pragmatic strain in Fascism, its will to power, its will to live, its attitude toward violence, and its value.

10. The cornerstone of the Fascist doctrine is its conception of the State, of its essence, its functions, and its aims. For Fascism the State is absolute, individuals and groups relative. Individuals and groups are "conceivable" in so far as they are within the State. Instead of directing the game and guiding the material and moral progress of the community, the liberal State restricts its activities to recording results. The Fascist State is wide awake and has a will of its own. For this reason it can be described as "ethical".

At the first quinquennial assembly of the regime, in 1929, I said:

"The Fascist State is not a night watchman, solicitous only of the personal safety of the citizens; nor is it organized exclusively for the purpose of guarantying a certain degree of material prosperity and relatively peaceful conditions of life, a board of directors would do as much. Neither is it exclusively political, divorced from practical realities and holding itself aloof from the multifarious activities of the citizens and the nation. The State, as conceived and realized by Fascism, is a spiritual and ethical entity for securing the political, juridical, and economic organization of the nation, an organization which in its origin and growth is a manifestation of the spirit. The State guarantees the internal and external safety of the country, but it also safeguards and transmits the spirit of the people, elaborated down the ages in its language, its customs, its faith. The State is not only the present; it is also the past and above all the future. Transcending the individual's brief spell of life, the State stands for the immanent conscience of the nation. The forms in which it finds expression change, but the need for it remains. The State educates the citizens to civism, makes them aware of their mission, urges them to unity; its justice harmonizes their divergent interests; it transmits to future generations the conquests of the mind in the fields of science, art, law, human solidarity; it leads men up from primitive life of the tribe to that highest manifestation of human power, Empire. The State hands down to future generations the memory of those who laid down their lives to ensure its safety or to obey its laws; it sets up as examples and records for future ages the names of the captains who enlarged its territory and of the men of genius who have made it famous. Whenever respect for the State declines and the disintegrating and centrifugal tendencies of individuals and groups prevail, nations are headed for decay."

11. From 1929 until today, political and economic development has everywhere gone to prove the validity of these doctrinal premises. Of such gigantic importance is the State. It is the State alone that can solve the dramatic contradictions of capitalism. The state of affairs that is called the crisis cannot be solved except by the State, within the State. Where is the shade of Jules Simon, who in the dawn of Liberalism proclaimed that, "The State must labour to make itself unnecessary, and prepare the way for its own dismissal"? Or of McCulloch, who in the second half of the last century argued that the State must guard against the danger of too much government? What would the Englishman, Bentham, say today to the continual and inevitable intervention of the State in the sphere of economics, when according to his theories industry should ask no more of the State than to be left in peace? Or the German Humboldt, according to whom the "lazy" State should be considered the best? It is true that the second wave of Liberal economists were less extreme than the first, and Adam Smith himself opened the door—if only very cautiously—to State intervention in the economy.

If liberalism spells individualism, Fascism spells State. The Fascist State is, however, a unique and original creation. It is not reactionary but revolutionary, in that it anticipates the solution of certain universal problems which have been raised elsewhere; in the political field by the splitting up of parties, the usurpation of power by parliaments, the irresponsibility of assemblies; in the economic field by the increasingly numerous and important functions discharged by trade unions and trade associations with their disputes and ententes, affecting both capital and labour; in the ethical field by the need felt for order, discipline, obedience to the moral dictates of the fatherland.

Fascism desires the State to be strong and organic, based on broad foundations of popular support. The Fascist State lays claim to rule in the economic field no less than in others; it makes its action felt throughout the length and breadth of the

country by means of its corporative, social, and educational institutions, and all the political, economic, and spiritual forces of the nation, organized in their respective associations, circulate within the State. A State based on millions of individuals who recognize its authority, feel its action, and are ready to serve its ends is not the tyrannical state of a medieval lordling. It has nothing in common with the despotic States existing prior to or subsequent to 1789. Far from crushing the individual, the Fascist State multiplies his energies, just as in a regiment a soldier is not diminished but multiplied by the number of his fellow soldiers.

The Fascist State organizes the nation, but it leaves the individual adequate elbow room. It has curtailed useless or harmful liberties while preserving those which are essential. In such matters the individual cannot be the judge, but the State only.

12. The Fascist State is not indifferent to religious phenomena in general nor does it maintain an attitude of indifference to Roman Catholicism, the special, positive religion of Italians. The State does not have a theology but it has a moral code. The Fascist State sees in religion one of the deepest of spiritual manifestations and for this reason it not only respects religion but defends and protects it. The Fascist State does not attempt, as did Robespierre at the height of the extreme delirium of the Convention, to set up a "god" of its own; nor does it vainly seek, as does Bolshevism, to efface God from the soul of man. Fascism respects the God of ascetics, saints, and heroes, and it also respects God as conceived by the innocent and primitive heart of the simple people, the God to whom their prayers are raised.

13. The Fascist State expresses the will to exercise power and to command. Here the Roman tradition is embodied in a conception of strength. Imperial power, as understood by the Fascist doctrine, is not only territorial, or military, or mercantile; it is also spiritual and ethical. An imperial nation, that is to say a

nation a which directly or indirectly is a leader of others, can exist without the need of conquering a single square mile of territory. Fascism sees in the imperialistic spirit—i.e. in the tendency of nations to expand—a manifestation of their vitality. In the opposite tendency, which would limit their interests to the home country, it sees a symptom of decadence. Peoples who rise or re-arise are imperialistic; renunciation is characteristic of dying peoples. The Fascist doctrine is that best suited to the tendencies and feelings of a people which, like the Italian, after lying fallow during centuries of foreign servitude, are now reasserting itself in the world.

But imperialism implies discipline, the coordination of efforts, a deep sense of duty and a spirit of self-sacrifice. This explains many aspects of the practical activity of the regime, and the direction taken by many of the forces of the State, as also the severity which has to be exercised towards those who would oppose this spontaneous and inevitable movement of 20th century Italy by agitating outgrown ideologies of the 19th century, ideologies rejected wherever great experiments in political and social transformations are being dared.

Never before have the peoples thirsted for authority, direction, order, as they do now. If each age has its doctrine, then innumerable symptoms indicate that the doctrine of our age is the Fascist. That it is vital is shown by the fact that it has aroused a faith; that this faith has conquered souls is shown by the fact that Fascism can point to its fallen heroes and its martyrs.

Fascism has now acquired throughout the world that universality which belongs to all doctrines which by achieving self-expression represent a moment in the history of human thought.

The Catechism of Race

*Taken from the 1940 edition of "Il Primo Libro del Fascista",
published in Rome by the National Fascist Party and intended for
Italian youth*

P.N.F.
Rome 1940-XVIII

PREFACE

The "First Book of Fascism" is a manual accessible to everyone which contains what is absolutely necessary to know about our Revolution, the Party, the Regime, and the Mussolinian State.

Indeed, in these short chapters — written in question and answer form, for the sake of convenience and clarity — one will find a summary of the moral, political and social organization of Fascism, as well as information on the principles, institutions and ordinances which today's Italy — in its new grandeur — is based upon.

Each Italian must live consciously in the Fascist era, and ignorance of the foundations of our existence as a Nation is unacceptable; therefore, we wanted to offer this simple guide to Fascists and to the Italian Youth of the Lictor (G.I.L.), because it is necessary for the cultivation of the spirit as well as for the daily acts of existence.

THE DEFENSE OF THE RACE

What is meant by 'race'?

Race is a mass of men similar in physical and mental characteristics that were inherited and will continue to be inherited.

What constitutes the Italian race?

The Italian race, which is Aryan of the Mediterranean type, is constituted by the very pure blood relationship that unites today's Italians to the generations that have populated Italy for thousands of years.

When did the racial policy of Fascism begin?

The principle of Fascist racial policy must be sought in the origins of Fascism itself, which was born, by will of Benito Mussolini, as a revindication of the genuine character and unmistakable virtues of the Italic people.

What were the developments of the racial policy during the various periods of the Fascist Revolution?

All the work of the Regime in the social field aims at preserving the Italian race from all dangers and at making it morally and physically strong through numeric power and continuous improvement. The protection of maternity and infant welfare, the preparation of the Fascist Youth, the development of social assistance and social security, the demographic policy in all of its guidelines and measures, the land reclamation, and the return to the countryside are all aspects of the grandiose battle that Fascism led and is leading — with original methods — in order to ensure the triumph of the Italian race in its absolute spiritual and physiological purity.

What effect has the conquest of the Empire had on Fascist racial policy?

The conquest of the Empire had the effect of imposing the protection of the unity and purity of the Italian race, as a condition of our colonizing superiority and because we must not allow blood mixtures which lead to the sad and repulsive phenomenon of race-mixing, which destroys nations and empires.

Do Jews belong to the Italian race?

No: Jews, even if they are born in Italy, do not belong to the Italian race. They represent the only population that has never assimilated in Italy because it consists of non-European racial elements, absolutely different from the elements that produced the Italians.

Who is considered a Jew?

The following is considered a Jew: he who was born to Jewish parents; or to a Jewish father and a mother of foreign nationality; or if, having been born from a mixed marriage, he professes the Jewish religion, or professed it after October 1, 1937.

What, generally speaking, has been the attitude of the Jews towards Fascist Italy?

World Jewry has been the instigator of anti-Fascism in all fields, despite the very wide tolerance that Jews have enjoyed in Italy—a tolerance which they abused prior to the adoption of restrictive measures.

What steps have been taken to maintain the purity of Italian blood and spirit and to defend the State and the national soul from any foreign and harmful infiltration?

The Regime has taken the following measures:

a) of a general nature:

the prohibition of marriages between Italians and those belonging to Hamitic, Semitic and other non-Aryan races;

the prohibition of State employees and employees of public institutions—civil and military personnel—from contracting marriage with foreign women of any race;

the requirement that marriages between Italians and foreigners—even to foreigners of other Aryan races—must have the prior approval of the Ministry of the Interior;

the strengthening of measures against those who diminish the prestige of the race in the territories of the Empire, and criminal sanctions for those who diminish the prestige of the race in front of the natives of Italian Africa;

the enactment of special laws concerning the status of mixed-race individuals in Italian East Africa and their reabsorption by the colored races.

b) of a particular nature:

the prohibition on the entry of Jews of foreign citizenship into Italy, and the expulsion of foreign Jews who came to Italy after 1919, even if they acquired Italian citizenship, except those over the age of 65 or those who contracted a mixed marriage with an Italian before October 1, 1937;

the exclusion of Jews from P.N.F.;

the exclusion of Jews from military service both in peace and in war;

the exclusion of Jews from public offices;

the exclusion of Jews from teaching in Italian schools of all levels and grades;

exclusion of Jewish pupils from Italian schools of all levels and grades;

the prohibition of Jews from owning, directing, administering or controlling companies that pertain to national defense, banks, credit or social security institutions, and companies of any nature that employ one hundred or more people;

the prohibition of Jews from possessing land valued at more than 5,000 lire and of buildings with a total taxable income exceeding 20,000 lire;

the prohibition of Jews from keeping persons of Aryan race as their domestic servants.

What exceptions have been granted to Jews who have particular military and civil merits?

Without prejudice in any case to the total exclusion of Jews from teaching in all schools and from attendance at universities, those Jews of Italian citizenship who belong to the following categories are exempt from the above restrictive measures:

the families of those Fallen in the four wars sustained by Italy in this century: Libyan War, World War, Ethiopian War, Spanish Civil War;

the families of volunteers in the Libyan War, World War, Ethiopian War, Spanish Civil War;

the families of veterans decorated for valor — or at least awarded the War Merit Cross — in the Libyan War, World War, Ethiopian War, Spanish Civil War;

the families of those who were maimed, disabled, or wounded for the Fascist cause;

the families of Fascists enrolled in the Party in the years 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, and in the second half of 1924;

families who have exceptional merits, to be evaluated by a special commission.

The Political Doctrine of Fascism

*Originally delivered as a speech in Perugia on August 30, 1925;
later reprinted under the title 'The Political Doctrine of Fascism'*

Alfredo Rocco

FASCISM AS ACTION, AS FEELING, AND AS THOUGHT

Much has been said, and is now being said for or against this complex political and social phenomenon called Fascism which in the brief period of six years has taken complete hold of Italian life and, spreading beyond the borders of the Kingdom, has made itself felt in varying degrees of intensity throughout the world. But people have been much more eager to extol or to deplore than to understand—which is natural enough in a period of tumultuous fervour and of political passion. The time has not yet arrived for a dispassionate judgment. For even I, who noticed the very first manifestations of this great development, saw its significance from the start and participated directly in its first doings, carefully watching all its early uncertain and changing developments, even I do not feel competent to pass definite judgment. Fascism is so large a part of myself that it would be both arbitrary and absurd for me to try to dissociate my personality from it, to submit it to impartial scrutiny in order to evaluate it coldly and accurately. What can be done, however, and it seldom is attempted, is to make inquiry into the phenomenon which shall not merely consider its fragmentary and adventitious aspects, but strive to get at its inner essence. The undertaking may not be easy, but it is necessary, and no occasion for attempting it is more suitable than the present one afforded me by my friends of Perugia. Suitable it is in time

because, at the inauguration of a course of lectures and lessons principally intended to illustrate that old and glorious trend of the life and history of Italy which takes its name from the humble saint of Assisi, it seemed natural to connect it with the greatest achievement of modern Italy, different in so many ways from the Franciscan movement, but united with it by the mighty common current of Italian History. It is suitable as well in place because at Perugia, which witnessed the growth of our religious ideas, of our political doctrines and of our legal science in the course of the most glorious centuries of our cultural history, the mind is properly disposed and almost oriented towards an investigation of this nature.

First of all let us ask ourselves if there is a political doctrine of Fascism; if there is any ideal content in the Fascist State. For in order to link Fascism, both as concept and system, with the history of Italian thought and find therein a place for it, we must first show that it is thought; that it is a doctrine. Many persons are not quite convinced that it is either the one or the other; and I am not referring solely to those men, cultured or uncultured, as the case may be and very numerous everywhere, who can discern in this political innovation nothing except its local and personal aspects, and who know Fascism only as the particular manner of behaviour of this or that well-known Fascist, of this or that group of a certain town; who therefore like or dislike the movement on the basis of their likes and dislikes for the individuals who represent it. Nor do I refer to those intelligent, and cultivated persons, very intelligent indeed and very cultivated, who because of their direct or indirect allegiance to the parties that have been dispossessed by the advent of Fascism, have a natural cause of resentment against it and are therefore unable to see, in the blindness of hatred, anything good in it. I am referring rather to those—and there are many in our ranks too—who know Fascism as action and feeling but not yet as thought, who therefore have an intuition but no comprehension of it.

It is true that Fascism is, above all, action and sentiment and that such it must continue to be. Were it otherwise, it could not keep up that immense driving force, that renovating power which it now possesses and would merely be the solitary meditation of a chosen few. Only because it is feeling and sentiment, only because it is the unconscious reawakening of our profound racial instinct, has it the force to stir the soul of the people, and to set free an irresistible current of national will. Only because it is action, and as such actualizes itself in a vast organization and in a huge movement, has it the conditions for determining the historical course of contemporary Italy.

But Fascism is thought as well and it has a theory, which is an essential part of this historical phenomenon, and which is responsible in a great measure for the successes that have been achieved. To the existence of this ideal content of Fascism, to the truth of this Fascist logic we ascribe the fact that though we commit many errors of detail, we very seldom go astray on fundamentals, whereas all the parties of the opposition, deprived as they are of an informing, animating principle, of a unique directing concept, do very often wage their war faultlessly in minor tactics, better trained as they are in parliamentary and journalistic manoeuvres, but they constantly break down on the important issues. Fascism, moreover, considered as action, is a typically Italian phenomenon and acquires a universal validity because of the existence of this coherent and organic doctrine. The originality of Fascism is due in great part to the autonomy of its theoretical principles. For even when, in its external behaviour and in its conclusions, it seems identical with other political creeds, in reality it possesses an inner originality due to the new spirit which animates it and to an entirely different theoretical approach.

COMMON ORIGINS AND COMMON BACKGROUND OF MODERN POLITICAL DOCTRINES: FROM LIBERALISM TO SOCIALISM

Modern political thought remained, until recently, both in Italy and outside of Italy under the absolute control of those doctrines which, proceeding from the Protestant Reformation and developed by the adepts of natural law in the 17th and 18th centuries, were firmly grounded in the institutions and customs of the English, of the American, and of the French Revolutions. Under different and sometimes clashing forms these doctrines have left a determining imprint upon all theories and actions both social and political, of the 19th and 20th centuries down to the rise of Fascism. The common basis of all these doctrines, which stretch from Longuet, from Buchanan, and from Althusen down to Karl Marx, to Wilson and to Lenin is a social and state concept which I shall call mechanical or atomistic.

Society according to this concept is merely a sum total of individuals, a plurality which breaks up into its single components. Therefore the ends of a society, so considered, are nothing more than the ends of the individuals which compose it and for whose sake it exists. An atomistic view of this kind is also necessarily anti-historical, inasmuch as it considers society in its spatial attributes and not in its temporal ones; and because it reduces social life to the existence of a single generation. Society becomes thus a sum of determined individuals, viz., the generation living at a given moment. This doctrine which I call atomistic and which appears to be anti-historical, reveals from under a concealing cloak a strongly materialistic nature. For in its endeavours to isolate the present from the past and the future, it rejects the spiritual inheritance of ideas and sentiments which each generation receives from those preceding and hands down to the following generation thus destroying the unity and the spiritual life itself of human society.

This common basis shows the close logical connection existing between all political doctrines; the substantial solidarity, which unites all the political movements, from Liberalism to Socialism, that until recently have dominated Europe. For these political schools differ from one another in their methods, but all agree as to the ends to be achieved. All of them consider the welfare and happiness of individuals to be the goal of society, itself considered as composed of individuals of the present generation. All of them see in society and in its juridical organization, the State, the mere instrument and means whereby individuals can attain their ends. They differ only in that the methods pursued for the attainment of these ends vary considerably one from the other.

Thus the Liberals insist that the best manner to secure the welfare of the citizens as individuals is to interfere as little as possible with the free development of their activities and that therefore the essential task of the State is merely to coordinate these several liberties in such a way as to guarantee their coexistence. Kant, who was without doubt the most powerful and thorough philosopher of liberalism, said, "man, who is the end, cannot be assumed to have the value of an instrument." And again, "justice, of which the State is the specific organ, is the condition whereby the freedom of each is conditioned upon the freedom of others, according to the general law of liberty."

Having thus defined the task of the State, Liberalism confines itself to the demand of certain guarantees which are to keep the State from overstepping its functions as general coordinator of liberties and from sacrificing the freedom of individuals more than is absolutely necessary for the accomplishment of its purpose. All the efforts are therefore directed to see to it that the ruler, mandatory of all and entrusted with the realization, through and by liberty, of the harmonious happiness of everybody, should never be clothed with undue power. Hence the creation of a system of checks and limitations designed to keep the rulers within bounds; and among these, first and

foremost, the principle of the division of powers, contrived as a means for weakening the State in its relation to the individual, by making it impossible for the State ever to appear, in its dealings with citizens, in the full plenitude of sovereign powers; also the principle of the participation of citizens in the lawmaking power, as a means for securing, in behalf of the individual, a direct check on this, the strongest branch, and an indirect check on the entire government of the State. This system of checks and limitations, which goes by the name of constitutional government resulted in a moderate and measured liberalism. The checking power was exercised only by those citizens who were deemed worthy and capable, with the result that a small elite was made to represent legally the entire body politic for whose benefit this regime was instituted.

It was evident, however, that this moderate system, being fundamentally illogical and in contradiction with the very principles from which it proceeded, would soon become the object of serious criticism. For if the object of society and of the State is the welfare of individuals, severally considered, how is it possible to admit that this welfare can be secured by the individuals themselves only through the possibilities of such a liberal regime? The inequalities brought about both by nature and by social organizations are so numerous and so serious, that, for the greater part, individuals abandoned to themselves not only would fail to attain happiness, but would also contribute to the perpetuation of their condition of misery and dejection. The State therefore cannot limit itself to the merely negative function of the defense of liberty. It must become active, in behalf of everybody, for the welfare of the people. It must intervene, when necessary, in order to improve the material, intellectual, and moral conditions of the masses; it must find work for the unemployed, instruct and educate the people, and care for health and hygiene. For if the purpose of society and of the State is the welfare of individuals, and if it is just that these individuals themselves control the attainment of their ends, it becomes

difficult to understand why Liberalism should not go the whole distance, why it should see fit to distinguish certain individuals from the rest of the mass, and why the functions of the people should be restricted to the exercise of a mere check. Therefore the State, if it exists for all, must be governed by all, and not by a small minority: if the State is for the people, sovereignty must reside in the people: if all individuals have the right to govern the State, liberty is no longer sufficient; equality must be added: and if sovereignty is vested in the people, the people must wield all sovereignty and not merely a part of it. The power to check and curb the government is not sufficient. The people must be the government. Thus, logically developed, Liberalism leads to Democracy, for Democracy contains the promises of Liberalism but oversteps its limitations in that it makes the action of the State positive, proclaims the equality of all citizens through the dogma of popular sovereignty. Democracy therefore necessarily implies a republican form of government even though at times, for reasons of expediency, it temporarily adjusts itself to a monarchical regime.

Once started on this downward grade of logical deductions it was inevitable that this atomistic theory of State and society should pass on to a more advanced position. Great industrial developments and the existence of a huge mass of working men, as yet badly treated and in a condition of semi-servitude, possibly endurable in a regime of domestic industry, became intolerable after the industrial revolution. Hence a state of affairs which towards the middle of the last century appeared to be both cruel and threatening. It was therefore natural that the following question be raised: "If the State is created for the welfare of its citizens, severally considered, how can it tolerate an economic system which divides the population into a small minority of exploiters, the capitalists, on one side, and an immense multitude of exploited, the working people, on the other?" No! The State must again intervene and give rise to a different and less iniquitous economic organization, by abolishing private

property, by assuming direct control of all production, and by organizing it in such a way that the products of labour be distributed solely among those who create them, viz., the working classes. Hence we find Socialism, with its new economic organization of society, abolishing private ownership of capital and of the instruments and means of production, socializing the product, suppressing the extra profit of capital, and turning over to the working class the entire output of the productive processes. It is evident that Socialism contains and surpasses Democracy in the same way that Democracy comprises and surpasses Liberalism, being a more advanced development of the same fundamental concept. Socialism in its turn generates the still more extreme doctrine of Bolshevism which demands the violent suppression of the holders of capital, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as means for a fairer economic organization of society and for the rescue of the labouring classes from capitalistic exploitation.

Thus Liberalism, Democracy, and Socialism, appear to be, as they are in reality, not only the offspring of one and the same theory of government, but also logical derivations one of the other. Logically developed Liberalism leads to Democracy; the logical development of Democracy issues into Socialism. It is true that for many years, and with some justification, Socialism was looked upon as antithetical to Liberalism. But the antithesis is purely relative and breaks down as we approach the common origin and foundation of the two doctrines, for we find that the opposition is one of method, not of purpose. The end is the same for both, viz., the welfare of the individual members of society. The difference lies in the fact that Liberalism would be guided to its goal by liberty, whereas Socialism strives to attain it by the collective organization of production. There is therefore no antithesis nor even a divergence as to the nature and scope of the State and the relation of individuals to society. There is only a difference of evaluation of the means for bringing about these ends and establishing these relations, which difference depends

entirely on the different economic conditions which prevailed at the time when the various doctrines were formulated. Liberalism arose and began to thrive in the period of small industry; Socialism grew with the rise of industrialism and of world-wide capitalism. The dissension therefore between these two points of view, or the antithesis, if we wish so to call it, is limited to the economic field. Socialism is at odds with Liberalism only on the question of the organization of production and of the division of wealth. In religious, intellectual, and moral matters it is liberal, as it is liberal and democratic in its politics. Even the anti-liberalism and anti-democracy of Bolshevism are in themselves purely contingent. For Bolshevism is opposed to Liberalism only in so far as the former is revolutionary, not in its socialistic aspect. For if the opposition of the Bolsheviki to liberal and democratic doctrines were to continue, as now seems more and more probable, the result might be a complete break between Bolshevism and Socialism notwithstanding the fact that the ultimate aims of both are identical.

FASCISM AS AN INTEGRAL DOCTRINE OF SOCIALITY ANTITHETICAL TO THE ATOMISM OF LIBERAL, DEMOCRATIC, AND SOCIALISTIC THEORIES

The true antithesis, not to this or that manifestation of the liberal-democratic-socialistic conception of the State but to the concept itself, is to be found in the doctrine of Fascism. For while the disagreement between Liberalism and Democracy, and between Liberalism and Socialism lies in a difference of method, as we have said, the rift between Socialism, Democracy, and Liberalism on one side and Fascism on the other is caused by a difference in concept. As a matter of fact, Fascism never raises the question of methods, using in its political praxis now liberal

ways, now democratic means and at times even socialistic devices. This indifference to method often exposes Fascism to the charge of incoherence on the part of superficial observers, who do not see that what counts with us is the end and that therefore even when we employ the same means we act with a radically different spiritual attitude and strive for entirely different results. The Fascist concept then of the nation, of the scope of the State, and of the relations obtaining between society and its individual components, rejects entirely the doctrine which I said proceeded from the theories of natural law developed in the course of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries and which form the basis of the liberal, democratic, and socialistic ideology.

I shall not try here to expound this doctrine but shall limit myself to a brief resume of its fundamental concepts.

Man—the political animal—according to the definition of Aristotle, lives and must live in society. A human being outside the pale of society is an inconceivable thing—a non-man. Humankind in its entirety lives in social groups that are still, today, very numerous and diverse, varying in importance and organization from the tribes of Central Africa to the great Western Empires. These various societies are fractions of the human species each one of them endowed with a unified organization. And as there is no unique organization of the human species, there is not "one" but there are "several" human societies. Humanity therefore exists solely as a biological concept not as a social one.

Each society on the other hand exists in the unity of both its biological and its social contents. Socially considered it is a fraction of the human species endowed with unity of organization for the attainment of the peculiar ends of the species.

This definition brings out all the elements of the social phenomenon and not merely those relating to the preservation and perpetuation of the species. For man is not solely matter;

and the ends of the human species, far from being the materialistic ones we have in common with other animals, are, rather, and predominantly, the spiritual finalities which are peculiar to man and which every form of society strives to attain as well as its stage of social development allows. Thus the organization of every social group is more or less pervaded by the spiritual influxes of: unity of language, of culture, of religion, of tradition, of customs, and in general of feeling and of volition, which are as essential as the material elements: unity of economic interests, of living conditions, and of territory. The definition given above demonstrates another truth, which has been ignored by the political doctrines that for the last four centuries have been the foundations of political systems, viz., that the social concept has a biological aspect, because social groups are fractions of the human species, each one possessing a peculiar organization, a particular rank in the development of civilization with certain needs and appropriate ends, in short, a life which is really its own. If social groups are then fractions of the human species, they must possess the same fundamental traits of the human species, which means that they must be considered as a succession of generations and not as a collection of individuals.

It is evident therefore that as the human species is not the total of the living human beings of the world, so the various social groups which compose it are not the sum of the several individuals which at a given moment belong to it, but rather the infinite series of the past, present, and future generations constituting it. And as the ends of the human species are not those of the several individuals living at a certain moment, being occasionally in direct opposition to them, so the ends of the various social groups are not necessarily those of the individuals that belong to the groups but may even possibly be in conflict with such ends, as one sees clearly whenever the preservation and the development of the species demand the sacrifice of the individual, to wit, in times of war.

Fascism replaces therefore the old atomistic and mechanical state theory which was at the basis of the liberal and democratic doctrines with an organic and historic concept. When I say organic I do not wish to convey the impression that I consider society as an organism after the manner of the so-called "organic theories of the State"; but rather to indicate that the social groups as fractions of the species receive thereby a life and scope which transcend the scope and life of the individuals identifying themselves with the history and finalities of the uninterrupted series of generations. It is irrelevant in this connection to determine whether social groups, considered as fractions of the species, constitute organisms. The important thing is to ascertain that this organic concept of the State gives to society a continuous life over and beyond the existence of the several individuals.

The relations therefore between State and citizens are completely reversed by the Fascist doctrine. Instead of the liberal-democratic formula, "society for the individual," we have, "individuals for society" with this difference however: that while the liberal doctrines eliminated society, Fascism does not submerge the individual in the social group. It subordinates him, but does not eliminate him; the individual as a part of his generation ever remaining an element of society however transient and insignificant he may be. Moreover the development of individuals in each generation, when coordinated and harmonized, conditions the development and prosperity of the entire social unit.

At this juncture the antithesis between the two theories must appear complete and absolute. Liberalism, Democracy, and Socialism look upon social groups as aggregates of living individuals; for Fascism they are the recapitulating unity of the indefinite series of generations. For Liberalism, society has no purposes other than those of the members living at a given moment. For Fascism, society has historical and immanent ends of preservation, expansion, improvement, quite distinct from

those of the individuals which at a given moment compose it; so distinct in fact that they may even be in opposition. Hence the necessity, for which the older doctrines make little allowance, of sacrifice, even up to the total immolation of individuals, in behalf of society; hence the true explanation of war, eternal law of mankind, interpreted by the liberal-democratic doctrines as a degenerate absurdity or as a maddened monstrosity.

For Liberalism, society has no life distinct from the life of the individuals, or as the phrase goes: *solvitur in singularitates*. For Fascism, the life of society overlaps the existence of individuals and projects itself into the succeeding generations through centuries and millennia. Individuals come into being, grow, and die, followed by others, unceasingly; social unity remains always identical to itself. For Liberalism, the individual is the end and society the means; nor is it conceivable that the individual, considered in the dignity of an ultimate finality, be lowered to mere instrumentality. For Fascism, society is the end, individuals the means, and its whole life consists in using individuals as instruments for its social ends. The State therefore guards and protects the welfare and development of individuals not for their exclusive interest, but because of the identity of the needs of individuals with those of society as a whole. We can thus accept and explain institutions and practices, which like the death penalty, are condemned by Liberalism in the name of the preeminence of individualism.

The fundamental problem of society in the old doctrines is the question of the rights of individuals. It may be the right to freedom as the Liberals would have it; or the right to the government of the commonwealth as the Democrats claim it, or the right to economic justice as the Socialists contend; but in every case it is the right of individuals, or groups of individuals (classes). Fascism on the other hand faces squarely the problem of the right of the State and of the duty of individuals. Individual rights are only recognized in so far as they are implied in the

rights of the State. In this preeminence of duty we find the highest ethical value of Fascism.

THE PROBLEMS OF LIBERTY, OF GOVERNMENT,
AND OF SOCIAL JUSTICE IN THE POLITICAL
DOCTRINE OF FASCISM

This, however, does not mean that the problems raised by the other schools are ignored by Fascism. It means simply that it faces them and solves them differently, as, for example, the problem of liberty.

There is a Liberal theory of freedom, and there is a Fascist concept of liberty. For we, too, maintain the necessity of safeguarding the conditions that make for the free development of the individual; we, too, believe that the oppression of individual personality can find no place in the modern State. We do not, however, accept a bill of rights which tends to make the individual superior to the State and to empower him to act in opposition to society. Our concept of liberty is that the individual must be allowed to develop his personality in behalf of the State, for these ephemeral and infinitesimal elements of the complex and permanent life of society determine by their normal growth the development of the State. But this individual growth must be normal. A huge and disproportionate development of the individual of classes, would prove as fatal to society as abnormal growths are to living organisms. Freedom therefore is due to the citizen and to classes on condition that they exercise it in the interest of society as a whole and within the limits set by social exigencies, liberty being, like any other individual right, a concession of the State. What I say concerning civil liberties applies to economic freedom as well. Fascism does not look upon the doctrine of economic liberty as an absolute dogma. It does

not refer economic problems to individual needs, to individual interest, to individual solutions. On the contrary it considers the economic development, and especially the production of wealth, as an eminently social concern, wealth being for society an essential element of power and prosperity. But Fascism maintains that in the ordinary run of events economic liberty serves the social purposes best; that it is profitable to entrust to individual initiative the task of economic development both as to production and as to distribution; that in the economic world individual ambition is the most effective means for obtaining the best social results with the least effort. Therefore, on the question also of economic liberty the Fascists differ fundamentally from the Liberals; the latter see in liberty a principle, the the Fascists accept it as a method. By the Liberals, freedom is recognized in the interest of the citizens; the Fascists grant it in the interest of society. In other terms, Fascists make of the individual an economic instrument for the advancement of society, an instrument which they use so long as it functions and which they subordinate when no longer serviceable. In this guise Fascism solves the eternal problem of economic freedom and of State interference, considering both as mere methods which may or may not be employed in accordance with the social needs of the moment.

What I have said concerning political and economic Liberalism applies also to Democracy. The latter envisages fundamentally the problem of sovereignty; Fascism does also, but in an entirely different manner. Democracy vests sovereignty in the people, that is to say, in the mass of human beings. Fascism discovers sovereignty to be inherent in society when it is juridically organized as a State. Democracy therefore turns over the government of the State to the multitude of living men that they may use it to further their own interests; Fascism insists that the government be entrusted to men capable of rising above their own private interests and of realizing the aspirations of the social collectivity, considered in its unity and in its relation to the past

and future. Fascism therefore not only rejects the dogma of popular sovereignty and substitutes for it that of State sovereignty, but it also proclaims that the great mass of citizens is not a suitable advocate of social interests for the reason that the capacity to ignore individual private interests in favour of the higher demands of society and of history is a very rare gift and the privilege of the chosen few. Natural intelligence and cultural preparation are of great service in such tasks. Still more valuable perhaps is the intuitiveness of rare great minds, their traditionalism and their inherited qualities. This must not however be construed to mean that the masses are not to be allowed to exercise any influence on the life of the State. On the contrary, among peoples with a great history and with noble traditions, even the lowest elements of society possess an instinctive discernment of what is necessary for the welfare of the race, which in moments of great historical crises reveals itself to be almost infallible. It is therefore as wise to afford to this instinct the means of declaring itself as it is judicious to entrust the normal control of the commonwealth to a selected elite.

As for Socialism, the Fascist doctrine frankly recognizes that the problem raised by it as to the relations between capital and labour is a very serious one, perhaps the central one of modern life. What Fascism does not countenance is the collectivistic solution proposed by the Socialists. The chief defect of the socialistic method has been clearly demonstrated by the experience of the last few years. It does not take into account human nature, it is therefore outside of reality, in that it will not recognize that the most powerful spring of human activities lies in individual self-interest and that therefore the elimination from the economic field of this interest results in complete paralysis. The suppression of private ownership of capital carries with it the suppression of capital itself, for capital is formed by savings and no one will want to save, but will rather consume all he makes if he knows he cannot keep and hand down to his heirs the results of his labours. The dispersion of capital means the end

of production since capital, no matter who owns it, is always an indispensable tool of production. Collective organization of production is followed therefore by the paralysis of production since, by eliminating from the productive mechanism the incentive of individual interest, the product becomes rarer and more costly. Socialism then, as experience has shown, leads to increase in consumption, to the dispersion of capital and therefore to poverty. Of what avail is it, then, to build a social machine which will more justly distribute wealth if this very wealth is destroyed by the construction of this machine? Socialism committed an irreparable error when it made of private property a matter of justice while in truth it is a problem of social utility. The recognition of individual property rights, then, is a part of the Fascist doctrine not because of its individual bearing but because of its social utility.

We must reject, therefore, the socialistic solution but we cannot allow the problem raised by the Socialists to remain unsolved, not only because justice demands a solution but also because the persistence of this problem in liberal and democratic regimes has been a menace to public order and to the authority of the State. Unlimited and unrestrained class self-defense, evinced by strikes and lockouts, by boycotts and sabotage, leads inevitably to anarchy. The Fascist doctrine, enacting justice among the classes in compliance with a fundamental necessity of modern life, does away with class self-defense, which, like individual self-defense in the days of barbarism, is a source of disorder and of civil war.

Having reduced the problem of these terms, only one solution is possible, the realization of justice among the classes by and through the State. Centuries ago the State, as the specific organ of justice, abolished personal self-defense in individual controversies and substituted for it State justice. The time has now come when class self-defense also must be replaced by State justice. To facilitate the change Fascism has created its own syndicalism. The suppression of class self-defense does not mean

the suppression of class defense which is an inalienable necessity of modern economic life. Class organization is a fact which cannot be ignored but it must be controlled, disciplined, and subordinated by the State. The syndicate, instead of being, as formerly, an organ of extra-legal defense, must be turned into an organ of legal defense which will become judicial defense as soon as labour conflicts become a matter of judicial settlement. Fascism therefore has transformed the syndicate, that old revolutionary instrument of syndicalistic socialists, into an instrument of legal defense of the classes both within and without the law courts. This solution may encounter obstacles in its development; the obstacles of malevolence, of suspicion of the untried, of erroneous calculation, etc., but it is destined to triumph even though it must advance through progressive stages.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE DOCTRINE OF FASCISM

I might carry this analysis farther but what I have already said is sufficient to show that the rise of a Fascist ideology already gives evidence of an upheaval in the intellectual field as powerful as the change that was brought about in the 17th and 18th centuries by the rise and diffusion of those doctrines of *ius naturale* which go under the name of "Philosophy of the French Revolution." The philosophy of the French Revolution formulated certain principles, the authority of which, unquestioned for a century and a half, seemed so final that they were given the attribute of immortality. The influence of these principles was so great that they determined the formation of a new culture, of a new civilization. Likewise the fervour of the ideas that go to make up the Fascist doctrine, now in its inception but destined to spread rapidly, will determine the course of a new culture and of a new conception of civil life. The

deliverance of the individual from the State carried out in the 18th century will be followed in the 20th century by the rescue of the State from the individual. The period of authority, of social obligations, of "hierarchical" subordination will succeed the period of individualism, of State feebleness, of insubordination.

This innovating trend is not and cannot be a return to the Middle Ages. It is a common but an erroneous belief that the movement started by the Reformation and heightened by the French Revolution was directed against mediaeval ideas and institutions. Rather than as a negation, this movement should be looked upon as the development and fulfillment of the doctrines and practices of the Middle Ages. Socially and politically considered, the Middle Ages wrought disintegration and anarchy; they were characterized by the gradual weakening and ultimate extinction of the State, embodied in the Roman Empire, driven first to the East, then back to France, thence to Germany, a shadow of its former self; they were marked by the steady advance of the forces of usurpation, destructive of the State and reciprocally obnoxious; they bore the imprints of a triumphant particularism. Therefore the individualistic and anti-social movement of the 17th and 18th centuries was not directed against the Middle Ages, but rather against the restoration of the State by great national monarchies. If this movement destroyed mediaeval institutions that had survived the Middle Ages and had been grafted upon the new states, it was in consequence of the struggle primarily waged against the State. The spirit of the movement was decidedly mediaeval. The novelty consisted in the social surroundings in which it operated and in its relation to new economic developments. The individualism of the feudal lords, the particularism of the cities and of the corporations had been replaced by the individualism and the particularism of the bourgeoisie and of the popular classes.

The Fascist ideology cannot therefore look back to the Middle Ages, of which it is a complete negation. The Middle Ages spell

disintegration; Fascism is nothing if not sociality. It is, if anything, the beginning of the end of the Middle Ages prolonged four centuries beyond the end ordinarily set for them and revived by the social democratic anarchy of the past thirty years. If Fascism can be said to look back at all it is rather in the direction of ancient Rome whose social and political traditions at the distance of fifteen centuries are being revived by Fascist Italy.

I am fully aware that the value of Fascism, as an intellectual movement, baffles the minds of many of its followers and supporters and is denied outright by its enemies. There is no malice in this denial, as I see it, but rather an incapacity to comprehend. The liberal-democratic-socialistic ideology has so completely and for so long a time dominated Italian culture that in the minds of the majority of people trained by it, it has assumed the value of an absolute truth, almost the authority of a natural law. Every faculty of self-criticism is suppressed in the minds and this suppression entails an incapacity for understanding that time alone can change. It will be advisable therefore to rely mainly upon the new generations and in general upon persons whose culture is not already fixed. This difficulty to comprehend on the part of those who have been thoroughly grounded by a different preparation in the political and social sciences explains in part why Fascism has not been wholly successful with the intellectual classes and with mature minds, and why on the other hand it has been very successful with young people, with women, in rural districts, and among men of action unencumbered by a fixed and set social and political education. Fascism moreover, as a cultural movement, is just now taking its first steps. As in the case with all great movements, action regularly outstrips thought. It was thus at the time of the Protestant Reformation and of the individualistic reaction of the 17th and 18th centuries. The English revolution occurred when the doctrines of natural law were coming into being and the theoretical development of the liberal and democratic theories followed the French Revolution.

At this point it will not be very difficult to assign a fitting place in history to this great trend of thought which is called Fascism and which, in spite of the initial difficulties, already gives clear indication of the magnitude of its developments.

The liberal-democratic speculation both in its origin and in the manner of its development appears to be essentially a non-Italian formation. Its connection with the Middle Ages already shows it to be foreign to the Latin mind, the mediaeval disintegration being the result of the triumph of Germanic individualism over the political mentality of the Romans. The barbarians, boring from within and hacking from without, pulled down the great political structure raised by Latin genius and put nothing in its place. Anarchy lasted eight centuries during which time only one institution survived and that a Roman one—the Catholic Church. But, as soon as the labourious process of reconstruction was started with the constitution of the great national states backed by the Roman Church, the Protestant Reformation set in followed by the individualistic currents of the 17th and 18th centuries, and the process of disintegration was started anew. This anti-State tendency was the expression of the Germanic spirit and it therefore became predominant among the Germanic peoples and wherever Germanism had left a deep imprint even if afterward superficially covered by a veneer of Latin culture. It is true that Marsilius from Padua is an Italian writing for Ludwig the Bavarian, but the other writers who in the 14th century appear as forerunners of the liberal doctrines are not Italians: Occam and Wycliff are English; Oresme is French. Among the advocates of individualism in the 16th century who prepared the way for the triumph of the doctrines of natural law in the subsequent centuries, Hotman and Languet are French, Buchanan is Scotch. Of the great authorities of natural law, Grotius and Spinoza are Dutch [Spinoza being a Dutch Jew]; Locke is English; l'Abbé de St. Pierre, Montesquieu, d'Argenson, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot

and the encyclopaedists are French; Althusius, Pufendorf, Kant, Fichte are German.

Italy took no part in the rise and development of the doctrines of natural law. Only in the 19th century did she evince a tardy interest in these doctrines, just as she tardily contributed to them at the dose of the 18th century through the works of Beccaria and Filangeri.

While therefore in other countries such as France, England, Germany, and Holland, the general tradition in the social and political sciences worked in behalf of anti-state individualism, and therefore of liberal and democratic doctrines, Italy, on the other hand, clung to the powerful legacy of its past in virtue of which she proclaims the rights of the State, the preeminence of its authority, and the superiority of its ends. The very fact that the Italian political doctrine in the Middle Ages linked itself with the great political writers of antiquity, Plato and Aristotle, who in a different manner but with an equal firmness advocated a strong State and the subordination of individuals to it, is a sufficient index of the orientation of political philosophy in Italy. We all know how thorough and crushing the authority of Aristotle was in the Middle Ages. But for Aristotle the spiritual cement of the State is "virtue" not absolute virtue but political virtue, which is social devotion. His State is made up solely of its citizens, the citizens being either those who defend it with their arms or who govern it as magistrates. All others who provide it with the materials and services it needs are not citizens. They become such only in the corrupt forms of certain democracies. Society is therefore divided into two classes, the free men or citizens who give their time to noble and virtuous occupations and who profess their subjection to the State, and the laborers and slaves who work for the maintenance of the former. No man in this scheme is his own master. The slaves belong to the freemen, and the freemen belong to the State.

It was therefore natural that St. Thomas Aquinas the greatest political writer of the Middle Ages should emphasize the necessity of unity in the political field, the harm of plurality of rulers, the dangers and damaging effects of demagoguery. The good of the State, says St. Thomas Aquinas, is unity. And who can procure unity more fittingly than he who is himself one? Moreover the government must follow, as far as possible, the course of nature and in nature power is always one. In the physical body only one organ is dominant—the heart; in the spirit only one faculty has sway—reason. Bees have one sole ruler; and the entire universe one sole sovereign—God. Experience shows that the countries, which are ruled by many, perish because of discord while those that are ruled over by one enjoy peace, justice, and plenty. The states which are not ruled by one are troubled by dissensions, and toil unceasingly. On the contrary the states which are ruled over by one king enjoy peace, thrive in justice and are gladdened by affluence. The rule of the multitudes can not be sanctioned, for where the crowd rules it oppresses the rich as would a tyrant.

Italy in the Middle Ages presented a curious phenomenon: while in practice the authority of the State was being dissolved into a multiplicity of competing sovereignties, the theory of State unity and authority was kept alive in the minds of thinkers by the memories of the Roman Imperial tradition. It was this memory that supported for centuries the fiction of the universal Roman Empire when in reality it existed no longer. Dante's *De Monarchia* deduced the theory of this empire conceived as the unity of a strong State. "Quod potest fieri per unum melius est per unum fieri quam plura," he says in the 14th chapter of the first book, and further on, considering the citizen as an instrument for the attainment of the ends of the State, he concludes that the individual must sacrifice himself for his country. "Si pars debet se exponere pro salute totius, cum homo siti pars quaedam civitatis ... homo pro patria debet exponere se ipsum." (lib. II. 8).

The Roman tradition, which was one of practice but not of theories—for Rome constructed the most solid State known to history with extraordinary statesmanship but with hardly any political writings—influenced considerably the founder of modern political science, Nicolò Machiavelli, who was himself in truth not a creator of doctrines but a keen observer of human nature who derived from the study of history practical maxims of political import. He freed the science of politics from the formalism of the scholastics and brought it close to concrete reality. His writings, an inexhaustible mine of practical remarks and precious observations, reveal dominant in him the State idea, no longer abstract but in the full historical concreteness of the national unity of Italy. Machiavelli therefore is not only the greatest of modern political writers, he is also the greatest of our countrymen in full possession of a national Italian consciousness. To liberate Italy, which was in his day "enslaved, torn and pillaged," and to make her more powerful, he would use any means, for to his mind the holiness of the end justified them completely. In this he was sharply rebuked by foreigners who were not as hostile to his means as they were fearful of the end which he propounded. He advocated therefore the constitution of a strong Italian State, supported by the sacrifices and by the blood of the citizens, not defended by mercenary troops; well-ordered internally, aggressive and bent on expansion. "Weak republics," he said, "have no determination and can never reach a decision." (Disc. I. c. 38). "Weak states were ever dubious in choosing their course, and slow deliberations are always harmful." (Disc. I. c. 10). And again: "Whoso undertakes to govern a multitude either in a regime of liberty or in a monarchy, without previously making sure of those who are hostile to the new order of things builds a short-lived State." (Disc. I. c. 16). And further on "the dictatorial authority helped and did not harm the Roman republic" (Disc. I. c. 34), and "Kings and republics lacking in national troops both for offense and defense should be ashamed of their existence." (Disc. I. c. 21). And again: "Money not only does not protect you but rather it

exposes you to plundering assaults. Nor can there be a more false opinion than that which says that money is the sinews of war. Not money but good soldiers win battles." (Disc. I. II. c. 10). "The country must be defended with ignominy or with glory and in either way it is nobly defended." (Disc. III. c. 41). "And with dash and boldness people often capture what they never would have obtained by ordinary means." (Disc. III. c. 44). Machiavelli was not only a great political authority, he taught the mastery of energy and will. Fascism learns from him not only its doctrines but its action as well.

Different from Machiavelli's, in mental attitude, in cultural preparation, and in manner of presentation, Giambattista Vico must yet be connected with the great Florentine from whom in a certain way he seems to proceed. In the heyday of "natural law" Vico is decidedly opposed to *ius naturale* and in his attacks against its advocates, Grotius, Seldenus and Pufendorf, he systematically assails the abstract, rationalistic, and utilitarian principles of the 18th century. As Montemayor justly says: "While the 'natural jurists', basing justice and State on utility and interest and grounding human certitude on reason, were striving to draft permanent codes and construct the perfect State, Vico strongly asserted the social nature of man, the ethical character of the juridical consciousness and its growth through the history of humanity rather than in sacred history. Vico therefore maintains that doctrines must begin with those subjects which take up and explain the entire course of civilization. Experience and not ratiocination, history and not reason must help human wisdom to understand the civil and political regimes which were the result not of reason or philosophy, but rather of common sense, or if you will of the social consciousness of man" and farther on (pages 373-374), "to Vico we owe the conception of history in its fullest sense as *magistra vitae*, the search after the humanity of history, the principle which makes the truth progress with time, the discovery of the political 'course' of nations. It is Vico who uttered the eulogy of the patrician 'heroic

hearts' of the 'patres patriae' first founders of states, magnanimous defenders of the commonwealth and wise counsellors of politics. To Vico we owe the criticism of democracies, the affirmation of their brief existence, of their rapid disintegration at the hands of factions and demagogues, of their lapse first into anarchy, then into monarchy, when their degradation does not make them a prey of foreign oppressors. Vico conceived of civil liberty as subjection to law, as just subordination, of the private to the public interests, to the sway of the State. It was Vico who sketched modern society as a world of nations each one guarding its own imperium, fighting just and not inhuman wars. In Vico therefore we find the condemnation of pacifism, the assertion that right is actualized by bodily force, that without force, right is of no avail, and that therefore 'qui ab iniuriis se tueri non potest servus est.'"

It is not difficult to discern the analogies between these affirmations and the fundamental views and the spirit of Fascism. Nor should we marvel at this similarity. Fascism, a strictly Italian phenomenon, has its roots in the Risorgimento and the Risorgimento was influenced undoubtedly by Vico.

It would be inexact to affirm that the philosophy of Vico dominated the Risorgimento. Too many elements of German, French, and English civilizations had been added to our culture during the first half of the 19th century to make this possible, so much so that perhaps Vico might have remained unknown to the makers of Italian unity if another powerful mind from Southern Italy, Vincenzo Cuoco, had not taken it upon himself to expound the philosophy of Vico in those very days in which the intellectual preparation of the Risorgimento was being carried on.

An adequate account of Cuoco's doctrines would carry me too far. Montemayor, in the article quoted above, gives them considerable attention. He quotes among other things Cuoco's arraignment of Democracy: "Italy has fared badly at the hand of

Democracy which has withered to their roots the three sacred plants of liberty, unity, and independence. If we wish to see these trees flourish again let us protect them in the future from Democracy."

The influence of Cuoco, an exile at Milan, exerted through his writings, his newspaper articles, and Vichian propaganda, on the Italian patriots is universally recognized. Among the regular readers of his *Giornale Italiano* we find Monti and Foscolo. Clippings of his articles were treasured by Mazzini and Manzoni, who often acted as his secretary, called him his "master in politics."

The influence of the Italian tradition summed up and handed down by Cuoco was felt by Mazzini whose interpretation of the function of the citizen as duty and mission is to be connected with Vico's doctrine rather than with the philosophic and political doctrines of the French Revolution.

"Training for social duty," said Mazzini, "is essentially and logically unitarian. Life for it is but a duty, a mission. The norm and definition of such mission can only be found in a collective term superior to all the individuals of the country—in the people, in the nation. If there is a collective mission, a communion of duty ... it can only be represented in the national unity." And farther on: "The declaration of rights, which all constitutions insist in copying slavishly from the French, express only those of the period ... which considered the individual as the end and pointed out only one half of the problem" and again, "assume the existence of one of those crises that threaten the life of the nation, and demand the active sacrifice of all its sons ... will you ask the citizens to face martyrdom in virtue of their rights? You have taught men that society was solely constituted to guarantee their rights and now you ask them to sacrifice one and all, to suffer and die for the safety of the 'nation?'"

In Mazzini's conception of the citizen as instrument for the attainment of the nation's ends and therefore submissive to a higher mission, to the duty of supreme sacrifice, we see the anticipation of one of the fundamental points of the Fascist doctrine.

Unfortunately, the autonomy of the political thought of Italy, vigorously established in the works of Vico, nobly reclaimed by Vincenzo Cuoco, kept up during the struggles of the Risorgimento in spite of the many foreign influences of that period, seemed to exhaust itself immediately after the unification. Italian political thought which had been original in times of servitude, became enslaved in the days of freedom.

A powerful innovating movement, issuing from the war and of which Fascism is the purest expression, was to restore Italian thought in the sphere of political doctrine to its own traditions which are the traditions of Rome.

This task of intellectual liberation, now slowly being accomplished, is no less important than the political deliverance brought about by the Fascist Revolution. It is a great task which continues and integrates the Risorgimento; it is now bringing to an end, after the cessation of our political servitude, the intellectual dependence of Italy.

Thanks to it, Italy again speaks to the world and the world listens to Italy. It is a great task and a great deed and it demands great efforts. To carry it through, we must, each one of us, free ourselves of the dross of ideas and mental habits which two centuries of foreign intellectualistic tradition have heaped upon us; we must not only take on a new culture but create for ourselves a new soul. We must methodically and patiently contribute something towards the organic and complete elaboration of our doctrine, at the same time supporting it both at home and abroad with untiring devotion. We ask this effort of renovation and collaboration of all Fascists, as well as of all who feel themselves to be Italians. After the hour of sacrifice comes

the hour of unyielding efforts. To our work, then, fellow countrymen, for the glory of Italy!

Truth and Lies About Fascism

From "Corriere della Sera," No.s 14 & 17, 1945

Carlo Alberto Biggini

After more than five years since the beginning of the Second World War, the need to re-present the problem of this war and its more remote aims has become even more pressing. The current conflict differs from any other in history not only for its extension over the whole globe, but also—and above all—for two new political and ideological factors that mark its fundamental characteristic: the relationship between the West and East, and the relationship between Democracy, Bolshevism and Fascism.

When the conflict broke out in the summer of 1939, one could be under the illusion that it would remain within the limits of a European war, a contest for supremacy between England and Germany, and one could look at it from this narrow point of view, siding with one side or the other. Although it is true that since then the ideological presuppositions of the contenders have given a particular physiognomy to the war, making the contrast between the political regimes the determining motive of it, at that time one could still, however, continue to think that behind the apparent ideological guise the problem remained essentially that of 1914. Not anymore: now this problem, even if it continues to exist in those terms, is by no means transversed by the greatest problems among which it has found itself inserted and therefore urges a new and deeper examination. We must, in short, free ourselves from the many notions and ideas with which we entered this Second World War, also because the starting points of it still rest in part on the previous historical epoch, such as the policy of European balance

of power, nationalism, internationalism—in other words, on the systems and political concepts derived directly from the French Revolution.

At the same time that this struggle of peoples is taking place, a social struggle is also being fought within each people; the old ruling classes, clinging to a declining era, want to maintain their privileges and power. This explains, in part, the numerous betrayals that took place during the course of this war.

The Anglo-Americans certainly did not wage war out of some desire to help or "liberate" any Western European people, but rather because they saw themselves threatened by the advent of a new era, which was expressed in Italy and in Germany with more strength and awareness than anywhere else. Therefore, in judging the present war, we must not adhere to the deceptive appearance of things, but to the intimate content of the ongoing revolution.

From the time of the Holy Alliance—which arose specifically to combat the ideas of 1789, which, despite everything, continued to act as powerful spiritual forces which changed the face of Europe—until the fall of the Hapsburg Empire, throughout that entire period, no idea substantially contrasted with that of the French Revolution, but rather a conception and a form of life—liberal life—and a tradition still tenaciously enragéd, which little by little were exhausted.

During the course of the First World War, people certainly were not fighting for the triumph of an idea: if a new idea was born, it was born only as a result of that war, after that war.

Wishing to be more adherent to the meaning of the current conflict, it is certain that 1941 marked a decisive turning point in the history of this conflict and it is still difficult to become conscious of the radical transformation of all the premises and of all the purposes. But, as the consciousness of the transformation is affirmed, we become conscious of the danger marked by the force of inertia, which leads us to continue on the path we have

taken, without having sufficient mental flexibility to adapt to the new situation and to understand its new meaning. And the contrast between the old and the new, between the original aims and the current ones, between the partial conflicts and their system, has now assumed such proportions that the conflict can appear as a gigantic event that carries people away from any prediction and any actual awareness.

Now, it is upon this profound change in the meaning of the world conflict that Italian men of culture must feel the need to concentrate all their attention, with the ruthlessness and serenity necessary to better understand and better fight. And it is also clear how they—due to the much broader point of view from which they want to put themselves—cannot but wish a similar attitude on the part of men of culture all over the world, with the hope of equal open-mindedness and serenity.

Of the two new factors that have been indicated as characteristic of the conflict—namely the relationship between the West and the East, and that between Democracy, Bolshevism and Fascism—the first revision which many need to make in order to facilitate a better understanding of the journey concerns precisely "Fascism", that is to say, the political ideology in whose name the world has taken up arms.

Fascism today, after twenty-five years of existence since its foundation in Piazza San Sepolcro, is still fighting against Bolshevism, but it is also directly at war against democracy. Or as we would say, between East and West. And it is precisely this de facto situation in the conflict that clarifies the intimate nature of Fascism and the political and social revolution that it represents.

Fascism has always had this two-front character and its whole history can only be truly understood when the twofold need for information and consequent need for synthesis is deepened.

In its internal history, Fascism, born from the struggle against disorder, was supported by the bourgeoisie and appeared to be a

bourgeois reactionary movement. And it was judged by many from this point of view, even after September 8, 1943. But the movement soon assumed a different physiognomy and, if one wanted to continue to speak of reaction, it was also necessary to recognize the emergence of a method of government whose fundamental characteristic is so-called totalitarianism. In other words, a process of statization began, which gradually invested all political and social life, preparing for the inevitable process of unification of social classes. Little by little, if one continued to stand in opposition to Fascism and to Corporativism, the opposition itself was split into two significant extremes.

On the one hand, indeed, the accusation of bourgeoisism and capitalism continued, and the end of class struggle saw the suffocation of the proletariat; on the other hand, the old bourgeois liberalism exploded, denouncing the statism of Fascism and recognizing in it a substantial affinity with Bolshevism. Significant extremes that now induce us, each time we are faced with an anti-fascist, to ask for further clarification: liberal or communist? Do you anti-fascists want a political regime in which the state machinery—which regulates all economic life—is dismantled, taking it away from free competition, which has governed all political life, hierarchizing it? Do you want to put an end to the hierarchical principle and the oneness of political command so as to bring the political struggle back to the level of democratic egalitarianism? Or do you want, instead, the end of every bourgeois residue, an iron statism capable of crushing any further velleity of the private person, the absolute subordination of the individual to the political organism, dictatorship to the bitter end and the continuous threat of capital execution? Liberals or Communists? But, when faced with this question, the anti-fascists respond by placing themselves on the right and on the left, demonstrating for this very reason, with obvious evidence, that the political problem of today is precisely that of the relationship between

liberalism and communism, in other words that problem of which Fascism represents the first brilliant attempt at a solution.

Fascism has had an equal fate in its external history. On the one hand the democracies, scandalized by authoritarianism, the end of liberty, statism, autarchy; on the other Bolshevism, which viewed Fascism as a bourgeois and capitalist regime, indeed as the most bourgeois and the most capitalistic of all regimes. And, just as internally liberals and communists have only anti-fascism in common, so externally democracy and Bolshevism have found themselves united together only by anti-fascism. But if Fascism were overthrown at the national and international levels, what would tomorrow be? The answer to this question is now becoming evident, because with the end of Fascism the only thing that could happen is a renewed clash between liberalism and communism, and therefore a new fatal Fascism.

This is the reason why the time is ripe for men—even adversaries—to review the problem of Fascism.

The necessity for its advent is already felt at a global level and the process of the war is accelerating the movement of ideological and political conversion. The very alliance between the democracies and Bolshevism leads inevitably to the approximation of the two extremes into some form of Fascism. Authoritarianism and dictatorship are already increasingly asserting themselves in England and America, the state machinery is progressively suffocating private initiative, the social problem is imposing itself and the various Beveridge type plans echo the reasons for Fascist legislation. And together with this transformation is the need to attribute to Russia an evolution in the opposite direction, towards greater liberty and towards a return to individual needs hitherto suppressed or suffocated. Still against Fascism, therefore, but increasingly taking on the problem and approaching its solutions. Still against Fascism, but, despite everything, for Fascism. Fascism has already won the war, because it has won on a revolutionary level.

The fact is that Fascism, before any other political ideology, understood that the truly revolutionary problem was that of the synthesis of liberalism and socialism, and that any other political attempt to establish itself while neglecting one of the two essential needs of present life is by now vain politics: the recognition of the personality of the individual and an effective solution to the social problem. Democracies and Bolshevism have so far understood only one of these two needs and have therefore not really understood anything.

But, if the guiding principle of Fascism has already become a more or less conscious requirement of every other political regime, so as to allow the prediction of its generalization, a fundamental objection is often felt to move against it, and it is that which concerns the way with which the principle has been translated into reality. Thus the need expressed by Fascism is no longer denied, but they continue to deny that Fascism has succeeded in fulfilling the proposed task and insists on the necessity of pursuing the same aim in another way, and in a very different effective manner. Thus in Fascism they see not a synthesis but a misunderstanding of liberalism and socialism, a hybrid combination, that is, in which the needs of both are mortified, without any positive result. And thus, even if on the same plane as Fascism, they have begun to suggest here and there a recipe for a truer and more comprehensive synthesis, in which the best of the two opposing regimes is saved and its defects and limitations are denied. No longer Fascism, therefore, nor Corporativism, but any other name they can come up with to designate that political and social principle that Fascism supposedly would not have been able to implement.

Now, no sincere Fascist would deny that there is some truth to this objection, at least up until September 8th, and indeed the objection itself was first raised—and continues to be raised—precisely among the most conscious Fascists, even before anyone else. It constitutes, in fact, to the extent that it is justified, the internal propulsive force of the revolutionary movement, the

stimulus for the continuous revision of itself, a dissatisfaction which is conducive also to radical improvements. Fascism, although it can boast a long and creative history, is still but at the beginning of its journey and it will have to accomplish many other steps before its ideal can be said to be purified from the waste that compromised it in the past and that would willingly try to compromise it again. Fascism therefore claims for itself the right and the duty to take this objection and to rest upon it the hopes and the will of the future. Fascism knows its insufficiencies, the dangers that loom over it, the distance that still separates it from its proposed aim; it knows the forces that have often rendered its tasks difficult and ambiguous; it has known, above all, active and passive resistance, both internal and external, which has altered and exhausted it. All of this Fascism knows and confesses, but precisely because of this, it denies with all its strength that the objection can be pronounced by others who are not Fascists. Because Fascism is not an abstract ideology that can be judged on the level of abstractions, it is not a utopia that can aspire to the perfection of a formal logic; it is a political movement that is inserted and operates within a specific historical reality and cannot be separated from it. Thus the only ones authorized to object would be the participants of another political movement that is able to translate into reality the same ideal principle while avoiding the errors of Fascism. It is too easy to establish in a map or in the formulation of some points a political ideal projected into the future, by which they intend the post-war period as the concrete beginning.

It is too easy to compare a purely theoretical perfection to a difficult practice. Fascism responds to such a claim by denouncing the current martinets as the true culprits of the negative aspects of Fascism. And not only that, we understand well that the internal martinets, taking refuge in the past, believed they could estrange themselves from Fascism, purging it of its own experience and contributing directly or indirectly to its deviations; but also, and above all, the external martinets who

with their twenty-five year misunderstanding up until July 25th forced Fascism to stiffen and react, the consequences of which everyone is now paying and especially the entire Nation. It was the reactionary forces within and without which, in its harshness of polemic, in its dull obstructionism, in its more or less conscious alteration of deeds, have day in and day out made an attempt on the life of Fascism and have tried to wear it down intellectually and morally. But now they vainly claim the right to set up another hypothetical regime in opposition to Fascism, which has the same *raison d'être* as Fascism, although according to them it does not have Fascism's imperfections. They cannot oppose reality with reality and therefore cannot guarantee the goodness of a future which they have shown themselves radically incapable of in the past.

When our martinets attempt to put their words into practice, they too will realize that the purity of their ideals will have to become muddled in the same way and for the same reasons that characterized the path of Fascism. Thus to the prediction of an extension of Fascism in the post-war period we can add the equally easy prediction of a Fascism with all the defects of ours and perhaps even worse than ours. And worse, we say, precisely because it came too late, that is, when the reactionary forces will be more powerful and more deeply rooted than they are now, when obstacles and deviations will be more serious. Worse, especially, because the phenomenon of capitalism is much worse than us and because the clash between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat will be more serious after another period of political maturation of the masses.

The greater negativity of foreign Fascism compared to Italian Fascism will naturally concern the fundamental principle of all political life: the principle of liberty. Now, it is precisely in relation to the idea of liberty that Fascism is most frequently opposed and it is precisely by looking to it that they hope for a political regime that goes beyond Fascism.

Except that, even in this regard, Fascism cannot accept the lesson that some claim to impart to it by contrasting it with the defense of certain fundamental liberties or certain rights of liberty. It can not accept it because it comes from those who have shown that they do not understand the greatest right of liberty: the right to work. And this simple right is to put in essentially new terms the problem of liberty, which non-Fascists delude themselves into thinking they can retain in traditional terms, albeit with some additions and some concessions to the proletariat.

The bourgeoisie must by now understand the meaning of the social and political revolution which is now in progress and must recognize that unifying the classes means unifying the liberties of the classes. But, as long as it insists on ignoring the liberty to which the proletariat tends, it will not be able to understand the difference between liberty and privilege, between rights and arbitrariness. Two classes means two degrees of liberty, and that is precisely privilege and slavery: wanting to defend liberty today by maintaining the distinction between social classes means only rhetoric and bad faith.

But how are classes and their rights to liberty unified? Obviously, if we are talking about two grades that are quantitatively and qualitatively different, we need a renunciation and a more or less large transformation of one class in favor of the other. That is to say, the bourgeois class must lose much of its liberty which in reality constitutes its privilege and must anticipate a lifestyle change in relation to mass needs. If it is able to convince itself of this necessity, it will collaborate towards unification with the least possible sacrifice; if, on the other hand, it refuses, it cannot but whine helplessly about violated liberties and will make the transition period much more serious and destructive.

Now, all the protests taking place at home and abroad against the "violations" of liberty characteristic of Fascism are

fundamentally due to a misunderstanding of its meaning, and, the greater the misunderstanding, the stronger the revolutionary need to react and to accentuate the contrast becomes. As a result, Fascism's effort to unify the classes is forced to take place increasingly in the sense of sacrificing traditional values to the needs of new exigencies.

It is this historical necessity that liberalism must convince itself of in the face of Fascism. Meeting the liberty of the masses does not mean, as the old liberal believes or pretends to believe, granting the masses the rights of liberty of the bourgeoisie, but granting—at the outset and as a prerequisite of all other freedoms—the right to work and equal starting positions in the struggle of life. This presupposition implies another set of presuppositions called programmatic economics, economic independence of the nation, constraint of private initiative, transformation of the right to property and, in the international sphere, redistribution of the world's wealth. If, being confronted with these needs, the national and international bourgeoisie shows proof of intelligence and collaboration, the revolutionary process can be carried out with relative tranquility; if, on the contrary, the bourgeoisie reacts by anchoring itself in its privileged position, then the impact, the violence and the authoritarian mediation of the arbitrator becomes fatal. Thus Fascist authoritarianism was born, and, if our adversaries wanted to point to the true culprit, they could only identify it in the anachronistic mentality of the liberals.

But authoritarianism also has another transiently irreplaceable technical function. To understand it, it is sufficient to look at wartime exigencies, i.e. the so-called war harness. In war everyone feels the need for full powers, the strong hand that unifies the efforts to reach the common goal; in war nobody feels the need to protest against the limitations imposed by the State.

Well, a revolution has the same exigencies as a war and cannot be carried out seriously without an exceptional form of

discipline. A new political regime cannot suddenly arise, immediately settling down in the form of an ordinary administration. It needs a unifying center that characterizes the period of transition, during which science and life will be building the new political institutes to foster an organic unification of the classes, which cannot materially and spiritually be established without an adequate process of maturation.

Hence why authoritarianism has characterized—albeit in different forms due to the diversity of individual historical conditions—all the new revolutionary regimes, from Bolshevism to Fascism, to Nazism, to Falangism, to large and small countries, from Turkey to Romania and Portugal. But above all, this is because authoritarianism is at the gates—and indeed has already broken through the gates—of the great democracies, which until recently mocked the political forms of Fascism. The social problem can no longer be neglected or left in the background and the same historical necessities must impose themselves in all countries.

Fascism is able to give the social and legal order a concrete content and is able to realize the condition because the idea of equality acquires its true meaning.

After all, the essential and new aspect of Fascism consists in having proclaimed, in having made laughable to everyone, in having made official, so to speak, the emptiness of modern society. With clear powerful intuition, Fascism grasped this void as the epilogue of the whole modern world and has made this immense emptiness the premise of its action.

Indeed, Mussolini, grasping it with a unique understanding of its depth, realized that the crisis of the modern world was translated into a social void, into a society in which the social bond had ceased, if the social bond is the recognition of the individual, in the active and concrete sense of life lived in common in the common enjoyment of the good things of life.

Does the State exist when the people are outside of it, when entire masses are socially and legally beyond its scope? This question, posed by Fascism during all its experience, marked a real return to the origins of the State, a re-proposal of the problem of politics in its constitutive terms: the foundation of the social city, the foundation of the State.

A revolution cannot be conceived without a revelation. And what else can the revelation be if not the knowledge of a state of mind, the interpretation of a lifestyle that urges and beats on the doors of those new times that are persistently sought, the awareness of new necessities, of new needs?

What meaning would the word 'political genius' have if it excluded an inventive, moral and political power? A 'genius' is one to whom the truth is revealed, one who finds the hidden truth or who creates the truth. He sees first what others do not see, and finds what others do not seek.

But how could our enemies have forgotten the words of the 1930 message in which Mussolini, like every true discoverer, certain of the unacknowledged truth, proclaimed that the Fascist conception, responding to universal needs, solves the triune problem of relations between the State and the individual, between the State and groups, and between groups and organized groups?

Now the problem can only have one true solution. And since the existence of this triune problem cannot be denied, once the true solution is found, it destroys all the pseudo-solutions.

In short, just as there is only one answer to an arithmetic problem, so in the great and decisive moments of history, in the movements that mark the epochs of the journey of peoples, the answer to a political problem is only one.

These are the reasons why we feel the need to address Italian and foreign men of culture and invite them to review their judgment of the reality of Fascism.

After twenty-five years of Fascism, the Italians feel they have a conception that is essentially freer than that of their judges and feel that they have concretely addressed problems that others today can barely grasp. Therefore they know that the destruction of Fascism is a utopia, the vain pursuit of which will only broaden the path of useless ruins. Even if the enemy succeeds in imposing a different political regime over all of Italy, this in itself would not kill Fascism, because the problems which led to Fascism would rise again more drastically, in a much more ferocious clash between liberalism and communism. The only result they would obtain would be the renunciation of an experience of twenty-five years and all the problems that have arisen laboriously during that period.

Italian culture is freer because it is enriched by this irreplaceable experience and is able to understand the opposing needs of others. It must continue to work to give profound doctrinal developments to Fascism, which, after September 8, 1943, had a great new revolutionary impulse. Meanwhile today, as the conflict is about to reach its decisive stages, Italy feels itself to be the most serene nation for being able to speak a word that is not merely partial. And other peoples can listen without prejudice to this non-deceptive voice. It cannot deceive, because, if Italy hates the enemy, everyone knows that hatred is only for evil and that it aspires to turn it into a feeling of living solidarity; it cannot deceive because, if it speaks of imperialism, it has given proof that it intends imperialism only as a fruitful and beneficent reason for work. Finally, it cannot deceive, because all of Italy's history demonstrates that a single aspiration has always been at the root of our conscience, namely a vision of life that has a universal character. Fascism today also wants to have this universal character, and if it fights in the East and in the West, it is only in view of a tomorrow in which a superior collaboration can be realized between these two worlds which are still very spiritually estranged from each other.

But, precisely because it is just as much Italian as it is universal, it is the faith for which Italy fights, and no one deludes himself into thinking that it can be easily defeated. If those watching superficially from the outside notice the intimate dissatisfaction of a revolutionary process that tends towards the better, they are certain that, under this critical feature characteristic of Italian intelligence, today as never before there is a profound awareness of defending a superior ideal reality.

My Religion

*Speech at the Conference in the Aula Magna of the University of
Florence, February 9, 1943*

Giovanni Gentile

I.

The speech that I intend to make is very delicate, because it easily lends itself to misunderstandings while it touches upon all the interests of human life.

And I will therefore strive to be frank and explicit, using the utmost sincerity, resolutely evading from the soul any consideration alien to the subject, in the hope that those who listen to me will believe in my sincerity and will be willing to take my words for how they they sound, without looking for any hidden meaning behind them that I did not say.

I also want to warn you that my way of philosophizing has accustomed me to the absolute sincerity of one who confesses with himself, and it has planted in my soul the conviction that the philosopher—the true philosopher—cannot speak to his fellow men except by using precisely that same language that he uses deep within himself.

And I would like to add, that today more than ever, in the present moment in which every Italian worthy of this name feels in his heart the tremendous responsibility of his past and present life and must, collecting himself, feel the presence of God, today I would be more ashamed more than ever to entertain my audience with the rhetoric of some academic discourse, or with

the virtuosity of arrogance suggested by the stale expertise of theologians and philosophers.

Today more than ever it is time to take matters seriously.

Thus, I will begin by making my open profession of faith, which perhaps will not appear as altogether new to those who are familiar with my writings.

I already made this profession in 1926; but since then it has benefited me very little, because many looked upon me with that distrustful attitude of those who fear "Danaos et dona ferentes"...

I thus repeat my profession of faith, whether it be pleasing or displeasing to my listeners: I am a Christian. I am a Christian because I believe in the religion of the spirit. But I would like to immediately add, to avoid any misunderstanding: I am a Catholic. And not merely since today; let this also be very clear.

I have been rigorously Catholic since June 1875, i.e. since the day I was born. And so I regret not being able to announce to you a story about a crisis, a storm of the soul, a sudden conversion, a stroke of lightning. I have been prosaically on the road to Damascus since the day I was born. [...]

"But" — I can already anticipate someone interjecting — "you complained that you didn't want to be misunderstood... You can't call yourself a Catholic except by giving that word a different meaning than how it is understood by the Catholic Church itself, which alone has the authority to define its meaning, so much so that the Church has condemned your writings, and you have engaged in so many polemics against various doctrines and sayings and manifestations of the Church. So how can we take seriously your claim of wanting to avoid misunderstandings?"

Allow me to recall that there was a time when parish priests and preachers showered me with divine graces.

I had the Crucifix put back in schools, and there were so many applauses and praises that, frankly, I thought I was starting to undergo a solemn canonization. Was this merely political on my part, i.e. opportunism or government trickery?

I had already openly expressed my opinion at a teachers' congress that was held in Naples in 1907, and I was met with strong opposition: I clearly reiterated my position again when the scholastic policy of the Fascist Regime, exaggerating and substantially altering my reform of 1923, wanted to extend religious education to middle schools and entrust it to ecclesiastics: this was contrary to my thesis of 1907, to which I remained firm.

Since then the hosannas have turned into shouts of "crucify him!". And my name, also due to this, has passed into the realm of legend. And concerning this, if I must tell the whole truth, I do not regret this; because legends, with their element of mystery, are problems that cause us to think, discuss and search, and, in short, move the spirits...

This does not mean, however, that I am so pleased with the legend that I want to artificially maintain it in the chiaroscuro of being and non-being. Let us therefore set the legend aside; and let's try to explain with the greatest possible clarity. If you ask me what my religion is, I tell you in all sincerity that I feel, and therefore I believe I am not only Christian, but Catholic.

II.

I told you why I am a Christian. The Christian religion is the religion of the spirit, by which God is spirit; but He is spirit inasmuch as man is spirit; and in the reality of the spirit God and man are two and they are one: so that man is truly man only in

his unity with God: divine thought and divine will. And God for his part is true God insofar as he is one with man, who completes His essence: God incarnate was made man and was crucified.

Why Catholic? Because religion is church; like any spiritual activity (scientific, philosophical, artistic, practical) it is universal, proper to a subject that expands to infinity: unlimited community, in which my God is God if He is God of all.

The error of the Reformation, as our Renaissance thinkers quite clearly saw, was that of wanting to turn religion into a private affair of that imaginary individual, who is not a man, a spirit, but a simple puppet of man placed in the spatiality and temporality of nature.

So much so that every Christian, who wants to be a pure Christian, is led by the very nature of the spirit to become proselytes, to form sects, to create a church: that is to say, everyone tries to be Catholic in his own way. Catholic means a church which, like any society, has an order and an authority that asserts itself: let's say a pope. A pope, an authority that approves or condemns; and a system from which it derives its operative norm and value.

It will be said: "But this definition purely and simply is not historical Catholicism, the Catholicism of the Catholic Church: it will be your version of Catholicism."

An old objection, which all the great Catholics have had to reckon with at all times. Those men, being great with that originality which is the mark of greatness, have always been—willingly and sometimes unwillingly—reformers; and in their attempts at reform they have impacted the disciplinary and ideal structure of the Church, which was always met with opposition by the conservative forces who reacted. It is a history which constantly repeats itself; it is the history of the Catholic Church itself.

And what was always the response of the reformers? The most effective one was that given by one of the greatest reformers that the Church has ever had in Italy: Gioberti. [...] Skepticism? Protogorism? No. Gioberti was not a sophist; and if he sinned in some parts of his philosophizing, his sin was certainly not that of skepticism.

Just as no one would contest my right to call myself an idealist because my idealism is my idealism and not everyone's idealism (which has never existed and never will exist), so I also have the right to call myself a Catholic of a Catholicism that is, will be and can not be anything other than my Catholicism... thus it can be said that true Catholicism is that which historically takes the form of a system of institutes and dogmas, but it is also true that institutes and dogmas do not objectively exist and operate outside the mind and soul of the believer; they are accepted and understood in the interior homine in the way that is possible for everyone to understand them: freely, with their own mind.

One can distinguish between nature and grace for all eternity: but a margin of freedom will always remain in human nature; a margin by which man can be redeemed by grace and an animal can not, much less a stone. Thus the institutes and dogmas and the whole actual Church have a history, which will always be human, although assisted by a superior divine inspiration; indeed they have it precisely because it was assisted by divine inspiration.

The dogmas of the Church are and cannot be anything other than my dogmas; and, in general, the Church to which I ascribe cannot be anything other than my Church: and obedience or rebellion, conformism or non-conformism, have a meaning only in relation, not to my Church, but to a Church that is not the true Church...

Historically the Church, in order defend its discipline and its unity and therefore its existence, has, through its central organs,

endeavored at all times to repress and annihilate this subjectivism eternally swarming from the depths of the spirits which it wanted to contain in its sphere. And how could the Church do otherwise. It did what was right, since the Church is necessary; it is, as is said, a divine institution, and can exist only on the condition of remaining a single, united Church.

But this does not mean that dissensions were not necessary, as well as rebellions and struggles, without which the Church would be stagnated in a dead sea, deprived of that spirit that gives it life, and therefore development, and therefore effective power, which is vitality.

And the divine inspiration of the religious spirit is precisely that which ends up making us see the soul fraternally linked to us in the sublime aspiration for truth, even through that grim look with which the enemy seems to stare at us. Hence the forgiveness and love of one's neighbor, which really makes us feel that "we are brothers, we are bound together", which is the greatest teaching of Christianity.

Which, it must be acknowledged, has never died out nor dried up through the events of the Roman Church...

What the Catholic Church wants to teach is worthy, in all its demands, of being welcomed by every high Christian spirit aware of the revolution brought about in the thought and life of man by the Gospel as a discovery of the life of the spirit.

Certainly I do not think I have betrayed the first religious teaching that was given to me by my mother (whose voice I still and always will hear within me), although perhaps today she would find me to be a very changed person. Changed, of course, on the inside, just as I have changed on the outside...

III.

At the beginning of this century, when I was teaching in Palermo, there was an excellent seminary, very cared for by the archbishop, Cardinal Lualdi, a person of fine intelligence and a high soul; and there was at the University a school of philosophy, to which numerous groups of clerics flocked.

And in the air was the smell of battle; souls were restless; and in the streets groups of young people and professors became heated in very lively discussions. *Inquietum cor meum*. And the youth anxiously searched for a faith.

The very restless heart of a good seminarian, who, no longer knowing how to endure the torment of doubts on which he was assailed concerning not a few articles of faith, asked the archbishop for comfort, tearfully making a vast and candid confession to him of the painful crisis he was going through, and imploring him to answer the most pressing questions that besieged him.

And the intelligent prelate did not scold him, nor did he have words of reproach that might have more than upset that agitated conscience or sound in any way like a condemnation or request of difficult consents. He preferred the language of paternal affection by asking him: "But tell me, dear son, do you believe in God?" The young man immediately answered yes: "Well", he added, "that is enough. Have courage and trust that He will provide you with the rest, which will help you overcome every doubt and regain lost peace."

That anecdote was joyfully reported to me by Don Onofrio Trippodo, an unforgettable friend during those years in Palermo, to whom my thought now returns with a sense of heartfelt nostalgia: he was a teacher in the seminary, but a student at the University and in continuous communion with the youth and with the teachers.

An assiduous reader of the modernist writers of the time, he was in correspondence with Laberthonnière and I believe also Professor Blondel; he was sincerely open to that vivifying breath of Catholic thought and to those modern philosophers which inspired modernism; but he was so wise and moderate and above all so absorbed in the divine, with a flame of faith that stood out in his eyes, that he earned the respect and love of the ecclesiastical authorities themselves.

Good and holy Don Trippodo, daily confidant of all my thoughts, teacher of religion to my children, what ardor in your soul, how it vibrated in your words and in your whole person! What power of love and sparking of life was in your happy and lethargic smile! What inner appeal in the sound of your voice, which interrogated me without pause but also without indiscretion, and forced me to think! To think with you, to think without preconceptions and without vain doubts, with confidence, with sincerity, with infinite desire for light and truth.

Your voice has still not faded from my heart; and in re-hearing it I wonder if I am worthy of you. You knew and recognized my Christianity and my Catholicism and you used to defend me against malevolent or corrective judges; because of your affectionate esteem, because of your fraternal company... you put so much faith and certainty in my heart.

After my departure from Palermo, he wanted to be a professor of Christian History at the University. And for ten years he taught a crowd of pupils with the joy of a soul that expands amidst its neighbor in the highest form of thought addressed to God.

But when he died in 1932, he had published none of his thoughts; and I think he left almost nothing written. Like Socrates, he preferred spoken discourses to writings: he preferred men to books; although he bought or procured many books and magazines any chance he could and always read them passionately: still more he loved to converse, to interrogate, to

scrutinize like the ancient Athenian, and to turn towards his fellow souls, and live in the lively dialectic of spirits.

But his words, although not written, remain and are immortal; they live in those who were familiar with him and who propagate his spirit: a good seed that renews life forever, even better than books.

How pleased Don Trippodo was with the few wise words marked by love which had been given by the archbishop to the young, lost and anxious seminarian!

And, indeed, faith in God is the substance of religion: And, indeed, faith in God is the substance of religion which, like everything that has spiritual value, is nothing definite and concluded, a system, a complex of ideas or revealed facts; that which is called a given. It is a seed that matures, sprouts and develops in minds which are well disposed, prone to meditation and open to love. And the dogmas or are generated by faith fertilized by love, and then they are living and vital things; or else they are thrown about like empty formulas: lifeless words, faces of Pharisees, whited sepulchres.

IV.

I agree therefore that the most religious religion is the Christian one; that this, like any other religion, cannot but be a church, and catholic (universal).

I also agree that the Church, as the positive life of religion, is history, and hence dogmas.

I agree that dogmas define the truth or content of religion, as negatives rather than positives: negation or condemnation of

errors, from which the truth must be distinct and preserved, rather than positive determination of the essence of the Divine.

Hence the nature of the relationship between the individual, who is a member of the Church, and the authority to which he must submit because the Church rests in the concreteness of its dogmas...

But is there still any need to illustrate the dialectic of this relationship between authority and freedom? Do we still need to make it clear that there is no authority that is not freely recognized? That is to say, that authority is indeed a limitation of freedom, but an internal limit and not an external one...? A limitation which the free activity of the believer himself subjects himself with by own freedom of choice?

And the shepherds of the Church, illuminated by that light which warms the hearts, opens the eyes and the intelligence and therefore avoid the vain attempts of sterile and provocative violence, they know that authority is exercised better with love than with force; and rather than the severe and dark intolerance of a Bellarmine, they prefer as much more effective and a more Christian example the humane and cheerful love of a Philip Neri, indulgent and thoughtful in the conviction that the sin of others is also our sin and that a saint is a holy if he does close himself selfishly and proudly in his holiness, but descends with his love upon the weak, and supports them and lifts them up with him in the hard work of goodness.

The adult must be like a child: "sinite parvulos venire ad me".

Love unites the adult with the child that must become an adult. And love, on the other hand, not hatred, must inspire the inferior towards the superior who, historically constituted as the end of the relationship of which he is another term, is not our enemy except in the first aspect, and must be known; and therefore we must meet him with sympathy and trust, certain that he is a man like us...

V.

Can there be a religion of the spirit without love and solidarity?

And what is spirit if not love, and therefore solidarity or that universality which is unity of all?

Christianity is imbued with this concept of unity, not of the cosmos or of nature, but of the spirit. Which is not multiple reality. Because multiplicity with the reciprocal negativity of its elements is a mechanism, or matter, although it is baptized.

When in fact we begin to recognize our spiritual reality, which is the only one knowable for us, since monads have no windows, all reality is spirit, as we experience it through the development of our own inner reality.

There are things in front of us: but, when questioned, they answer us.

They respond to us and participate in our feelings...

And then, besides things, there are our fellow men, other men. Similar at first in appearance; but only if we look at them with sympathy, and behold their smile which manifests to us a very deep similarity. The soul shines from the face. And already the face replied to us with a language that is the form of our secret thought. Here we truly are in our world: the spirit.

The object in which our feeling and thinking were affixed, the more we feel and think and the more we speak and understand; and his word gradually sounds in our ears like the word that flows from our chest: the same word, the same soul.

This divine being whose immediate presence in the depths of our conscience constitutes the ineffable human feeling of God, the supreme certainty in which is the root of every certainty; this divine being annihilates and exalts us, makes us bend our knees

and bend our foreheads in the dust but it infuses us with the strength to raise our eyes to heaven, and makes us feel in our hearts that superior grace, that powerful inspiration from which man is from time time transcendent in the eternal.

Here is the origin and essence of religion.

But religion does not stop at this initial and negative moment. The object is placed and rises before man so that man may realize himself in his inner being of self-consciousness...

God humanizes himself; and man in dialogue and in communion with God (spirit, person), ascertains that he as a man is nothing immediate, but thinks, wants, loves and, in short, is eternally realized in the living actuality of the synthesis of the divine and human.

Man would not recognize himself in a God who was not a spirit and a person; and through his objectivity, closed and refractory to every human interpenetration, he could not carry out that self-consciousness in which he also consists.

To say man is therefore to say God; and to say God is to say man; that man that every son of Eve always is and never is: that ideal that he finds in himself as the one who has freedom, that is, the possibility of moving in the infinite, and therefore thinking according to truth and acting by observing his duty and therefore to participate in the world of eternal values; but he finds it—this ideal—in himself as a term that infinitely transcends what he finds himself to be whenever he returns to consider what he is, what he has said, done, thought.

VI.

I hope that among my listeners nobody thinks to accuse me of humanizing God, or deifying man, thereby reducing to one the two essential terms of the relationship.

And even more so I hope that no one thinks of attributing to me the insane claim of man as the creator of God, as the fearful fetish worshipers often like to impute; for, unfortunately, in the bosom of the Catholic Church there are some who ascend the pulpits and horrify the frightened souls with unlikely stories of actualism.

These fears and misunderstandings derive from the un-Christianly separation of what God has joined together: God himself and man, making them two opposite sides of a single street, in which one will never be able to meet without a miracle....

Man and God are certainly distinct; but they are not separate except as abstract terms from the living reality which is synthesis.

Synthesis of God who becomes man, and man who by grace adapts to God, doing his divine will ("fiat voluntas tua!").

Without that unity which is the reason for this synthesis, there is no Christianity, no religion of the spirit; which, to reduce it to a formula, is duality, but a duality which is unity.

Divorce or antagonism, which purports to save, is worse than paganism; because even the pagan believed, and therefore trusted, hoping for a reconciliation of the natural and the supernatural, of man with God.

The man who discovers God in himself, and in a certain way thus creates him, is not the natural man, but the man who is spirit, already entered into the kingdom of the spirit, where he is man but is also God. Which therefore comes to be created not by

man, but rather by himself. And the God who is humanized is Christ; and those who, through his grace, share in his divine nature.

How is it possible for intelligent Christians to be scandalized? I believe that Christianity requires intelligence; it requires, like all that is human, a spirit that revives words, not words that kill the spirit.

Indeed, I too have always spoken of the unknown and of mystery, as the domain of religious faith; and I affirmed that religion begins where the critical process of reason that investigates and discovers the truth stops.

To define it, God is the abstract object; which, abstract from the subject, is the Whole, next to which the subject no longer remains. God everything, and man nothing: this is the motto of the mystic, the most logically religious spirit.

And I have said many times that even the mystic, despite his fierce desire to annihilate himself, adores God. He kneels, humiliates himself, but raises the altars, builds temples and enriches them with the cheerful fantasies of art, in which the exuberant wealth of his misunderstood subjectivity pours forth and triumphs for the benefit of the believer's mysticism itself.

And yet I have warned that in practice the act of the spirit will never be neither pure art nor pure religion, and that the only religion that exists is the one celebrated in the actual life of the spirit, where all its vigor is explained in the synthesis of thought.

Therefore religion is nurtured and cultivated in intelligence, outside of which it evaporates and vanishes into an elusive phantom.

The mutual exclusion of opposites is a tendency to limit, the achievement of which would be the fall of both opposites.

Religion grows, expands, consolidates and lives within philosophy, which incessantly elaborates the immediate content of religion and places it in the life of history.

Because religion *stricto iure* has no history.

History contaminates it with its development, which removes it from the immediacy in which religious sentiment jealously arises as a rigid truth, whose alteration is falsification, a work of man and not of God. Which is the reason why, since its origin, the historiography of religion has been held in suspicion as the source and germ of heterodox and heretical doctrines.

VII.

And here my speech can come to end. If for no other reason, for the sake of discretion.

But in truth it resembles the Palazzo Nonfinito—the "Unfinished Palace"—which is located here in Florence on Via del Proconsolo. Unfinished, but still beautiful; and inside there are so many things to behold.

I know that many things still remain to be clarified, so many doubts remain to be eliminated, so many problems remain to be solved.

But I do not pretend that my listeners can, thanks to me, climb up to the top of the mountain, illuminated by the sun; nor do I claim to have reached the summit...

I feel the light of the summit, but the peak still remains to be conquered.

And I cannot promise myself or others anything more than the effort of climbing...and if in departing from you I cannot

presume to leave you fully satisfied, at least I have made you think! My goal has been reached.

The Corporative State

Published in La Rassegna italiana, May-June 1930

Giuseppe Bottai

Between the years 1919 and 1922, a turbulent period of disorder and disintegration in society and in the State, in this Italy of ours men were perhaps not lacking who could have brought together and directed the perplexed and scattered energies in the cause of preservation and defence and of necessary reaction. But, as I have observed elsewhere, there was one man only, Benito Mussolini, who, thrust forward by a revolutionary impulse, had the force to take up again the historical thread of the Italian Revolution. If the Bolshevik upheaval was one of the dangers which threatened Italy after the war and the victory, another was the conservative political involution. It was necessary to find the way toward the future, between upheaval and conservatism. Signor Mussolini presented himself to take up again our revolutionary tradition, which was turned aside in the last years of the Risorgimento, and has only today translated itself into institutions and laws.

Thus the bases of the new order, which is being realized step by step, were suggested even before the March on Rome by the Duce, who, while he battles and strives, radiates in all directions his creative thought. Let us consider Signor Mussolini in the formation of the corporative State. The inflexible constructor of today is already fully manifest in the discourse to the workmen of Dalmine in March, 1919. "You act in the interests of your class, but you have not forgotten the nation. You have spoken of the Italian people, not only of the metal workers, to whose category you belong". The Minister of Corporations [Guilds] who, in preparing the Charter of Labour, sets before the

representatives of the Syndicalist Associations the fundamental principle that "there must be equal rights for all social classes," and in the Charter itself states that there is "judicial equality between employers and workers," echoes the noble words pronounced eight years before: "You are not the poor, the humble, the rejected, according to the old phrases of literary socialism; you are the producers, and it is as such that you assert your right to treat with industrialists as peers with peers".

However, in speaking of the corporative State, it must not be under stood as meaning only all that which pertains to the relations between employers and workers—relations based on a principle of collaboration rather than upon a struggle of classes. Fascism with its new arrangements aims at a more complex end. This, summed up in a few words, is "to reassert the sovereignty of the State over those syndicates, which, whether of an economic or social kind, when left to themselves broke out at one time against the State, subjecting the will of the individual to their own arbitrary decision, almost causing the rise of judicial provisions alien to the legal order of the State, opposing their own right to the right of the State, subordinating to their own interests the defenceless classes, and even the general interest, of which the State is naturally the judge, champion and avenger".

In this way, having as a solid basis the principle of functional subordination of the Associations to the State, the corporative arrangement, as it progresses by degrees proves itself to be the foundation of the high political structure. From what was a sectional, quarrelsome, monopolistic, internationalist syndicalism. Fascism has been able to evolve and develop elements of solidarity, of discipline and force, creating a new constitutional system. A reversal of values appears in this process: Fascist syndicalism is the opposite of that which existed before Fascism, for pre-Fascist syndicalism was against the State, and Fascist syndicalism submits to the State.

That is not to say that pre-Fascist syndicalism had no justification. The liberal State was incapable of appreciating the good which it contained, or that which was of historical or human interest in it. The liberal State took its stand on the rights of the individual an idea too elementary in the face of new judicial needs. The tragic error of liberalism, from which arose with all its violence the phenomenon of class justice, came about by having admitted the working classes to political rights without assuring them parity of contract, that is, equality of civil right.

Now it is not necessary to adore the masses, but they cannot be repulsed or ignored. "We have had to accept syndicalism, and we do so," declared Signor Mussolini at Udine on the eve of the March on Rome. "Only with the masses, which have a place in the life and history of the nation, shall we be able to make a foreign policy." A splendid, clear intuition! In all countries the power of the masses tends to shift from domestic to international politics. The example of the Pan-American Congress of Syndicates, held at Washington in 1927, is sufficient to illustrate this.

Fascism, then, not only does not remain in ignorance and fear of the values and the forces which arise from certain tendencies, but recognizes, disciplines, and organizes them for the supreme ends of the nation and the State, which thus gathers into its ethical and political sphere all social life, that is to say all social and economic forces at work among its citizens, endowing them with its ethical and political spirit.

At this time, therefore, when we want to define the Fascist State, and distinguish it from other forms of States, we say that it is a corporative State. Such a definition, however, may appear anything but clear, unless our conception of the corporative State is accurately explained.

Although, as I have indicated elsewhere, the adjective "corporative" has become one of common acceptance and has found its way into political as well as into scientific language,

nevertheless the idea which it contains, and by which it is inspired, is only slowly becoming clear and revealing its content. At an earlier time, by "corporative" was understood all that which regarded the relations between employers and workers, from the point of view of collaboration rather than of conflict between classes. The word thus had a limited application and was not given its full meaning, which is of an eminently political and legal character.

This character has not been, and is not always considered, and so confusions and mistakes arise. For instance: before the passing of the law of April 3rd, 1926, no. 563, there existed in Italy a national syndicalism, an emanation of Fascism inspired by the ideas of collaboration, but it certainly would not have been correct to speak of a corporative State.

This was begun only when the State stepped in to discipline the associations of producers, and elevate them to a legal status, to assign to them their character as legal organizations, and to give them special representation which permitted them to stipulate collective labour contracts and to impose contributions on their own members. It is thus clear that the meaning of the word "corporative" must be sought only in the legal regulations by which the Fascist State has realized itself as a concrete example of a truly sovereign State, containing fully in itself the civil society of which it is the form: an accomplished unity in which the said society exalts itself and attains its own perfect autonomy.

Although from an analysis of the principles which underlie Fascist legislation concerning the recognised syndicalist associations, (from the law of April 3rd, to the more recent law relative to the National Corporative Council), we can use the word "corporative" in a scientific and rigorous sense; even so the same word is not quite clear until we explain the legal principles which govern Fascist corporative legislation. If it is true from a technical point of view that a law must find in itself the justification for its own imperative force and for the

limitations of the rules contained in it, it is also incontestable that the interpretation of the law cannot be other than systematic and historical.

But, because of its historical character, the principles of a judicial system always resolve themselves into the manifestation of a higher idea—that of the State, which is of an eminently political nature; therefore it is evident that to get an exact idea of the meaning of the phrase "corporative State," which is commonly used to define the Fascist State, it is necessary to look to the ends which this State has in view as the fundamental motives of its action. The Fascist State, to one who studies it with such intention, reveals itself as an organic complex, moved by a will that is determined by an admirably logical theory.

Moreover it is not a difficult matter to identify the aims of the Fascist State, since this State, unlike others, defined itself in the declarations contained in the "Charter of Labour", which is therefore a document indispensable for its comprehension.

It is of no importance that some persons, still dominated by a spirit of faction, have found in the "Charter" nothing but a collection of aphorisms, while others, possibly in good faith, have discovered in it merely some enunciations of an explanatory or axiomatic character. The truth is very different. As it would be an error to deny the political and historical value of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, formulated by the French Revolution, so it would be an equal error not to see in the "Charter of Labour" the most solemn political assertions of the Fascist State, which tends to realize in itself the moral, political and economic unity of the Italian nation. And here economic unity is conceived as being inseparable from the national interests and their aims,—namely the well-being of the producers and the development of the national life. Having fixed in their general outline the aims of the Fascist State, we pass on to various observations: first of all, in no other State is economic unity realized as it is in the Fascist State, which in this sense

manifests itself as the most complete type of State. If the liberal State marked a progress in comparison with the absolutist regime, in so far as it performed its historical function of admitting the bourgeoisie who had been kept outside till then, the Fascist State is still nearer to perfection, since it has brought under its sovereignty those economic forces, workers as well as capitalists, which were not only without legal discipline, but which acted against the State. In this manner the State received shocks from within as well as from without, both from the capitalists who aimed at subjugating it, and were ready to associate themselves with international plutocracy, and from the working classes who were urged on by socialism to overthrow the State, and were leagued with an internationalism which denied the patriotic ideal.

Hence the crisis of the modern State, which could have been met only by means of a political, moral, and economic unification of society in the State, or of society which makes itself one with the State. This, then, is the achievement of the Fascist State, in which there are no individuals or groups of individuals which it does not recognize, subordinate and regulate, according to its aims.

At this point, however, it is important to understand that if society in the Fascist State has accomplished its own unification and has raised it self to a higher grade, this does not imply a social levelling, which would be quite as harmful as the disintegration which previously threatened public safety and weakened the organism of the State.

The most difficult task of the Fascist State was not to oppose the distressing consequences of the liberal regime, but to find the best way in which authority could assert itself without suppressing liberty, and without thereby running the risk of destroying itself. Turning to the question of economic unity, we may say that it would have been very inconvenient, and would have constituted a dangerous illusion, to attain this without

understanding the reasons for the syndicalist organization which is closely related to the production and distribution of the wealth created by modern capitalism. This error, however, was not easy to avoid, considering the aberrations to which syndicalism had abandoned itself, especially in the period following the war, when it was transformed from an economic instrument into a purely political weapon of offence against even the most sacred ideals of civilization. And thus when liberalism inexorably had to destroy every form of association, it did so essentially by means of a system of castes, similar to the ancient and noble medieval guilds of arts and crafts, from which outsiders were excluded and in which all free activity was prohibited.

The Fascist State, endowed with a spirit eminently political, and therefore realistic, and animated at the same time by the firm resolve to put itself on a legal basis, had to find the occasion for the reconciliation between social forces and its own sovereignty, in the legal recognition of the forces themselves. It had to act so as to have in its presence only individuals and groups whose position had been declared legal: individuals thus acquired the character of citizens, and their groups, the character of "juridical persons,"—legal associations. In short, existing syndicates had to become legal syndicates, and the Fascist State has accomplished this.

Let us now see what is the precise legal position of these recognized syndicalist associations. They are, in the first place, regarded as "juridical persons" active and passive at the same time, that is to say, having both rights and duties. They have rights, not only over their members, but also over all those who are in the categories to which their members belong, inasmuch as the recognized association has by law the right to levy contributions both on those inscribed and those not inscribed, and to represent them in regulating the conditions of labour. The recognized associations have duties, because, having the "jus imperi" and as "juridical persons," they must render account to

the State for the manner in which they conduct themselves in the spheres of action assigned to them.

Since they are recognized as having legal personality, it follows that the recognized syndicates are no longer outside the State, but within the State; there is now only one, and not, as before, many syndicates for each category; they are no longer against the State, or indifferent to it, but are at its service. In other words, if the syndicates are recognized, they have a right to life and liberty of action, but this liberty does not go beyond a certain limit which is determined by the interest of the other incorporated bodies, and particularly by the general interest. This latter constitutes a legal limit which becomes, like all similar limits, a legal duty—preeminently a legal duty in the eyes of the State, which is the guardian "par excellence" of the general interest.

The syndicate, finally, with regard to its own members, has not only the power of representation and of levying contributions, as has been said, but has besides this duties which range from the guardianship of economic and moral interests to the assistance even of non-members and to the moral and national education of both. Each recognized syndicate therefore gives unity to its own category of producers, represents, protects, assists and educates them morally and nationally; and in this unification it keeps ever present the two inseparable aims: the well-being of its category, and the development of national power. But those whom the recognized syndicates represent are not mere citizens; they have the legal and moral character of producers; their position is not simply that of subjects before the sovereignty of the State, but more specifically that of passive "juridical persons." There is a double reason for this: first, in the eyes of the State their duty is to work, and, second, they are responsible, in the case of certain undertakings, for the direction of production, even if it is private, because the private organization of production has been declared to be a matter of national interest, or what is the same thing, of interest to the State.

Thus we reach the federations and the confederations of employers and of workers, organisms which trace their origin to the fact that all categories of producers are bound together by their relations with other categories, while the resulting groups are joined with others in still larger combinations, by the interests they represent, and by the territorial district in which they act, where they assert their common economic activity and labour in some special branch of production. The organization of the producers thus reflects what is commonly called "the law of the division of labour," which from another point of view reveals itself as a law of the unification of labour. Among the recognized syndicalist associations, both of the lower and upper grade, federations and confederations, there also exists a complexity of relations in which representation, protection, and syndicalist assistance reach their highest development, especially when the legal limits of each sphere are kept distinct. When the syndicalist order is considered merely in its vertical structure, the functions of protection and of assistance stand out in special relief; and when one recognized syndicate cannot oppose another of employers or of workers in the same productive category, it tends to become an instrument of economic perfection for its own members. As the recognized syndicalist associations are of two sorts for each branch of production,—one for employers and the other for workers—, the distinction cannot result in separation, nor must it produce strife, inasmuch as the Fascist State, as an organic and sovereign State, admits competition, but not any violent clash of social forces.

We come now to the relations of employers and employed. These are regulated between the different categories by collective contracts, which have binding force over all those who belong to the same categories whether they are enrolled in the syndicates or not. On the other hand, controversies which may arise between the said categories, respecting the application of collective contracts or of other existing regulations, or requests for new conditions of labour, must be settled in a conciliatory manner by

the recognized associations of superior grade and by the coordinating agencies, or, if conciliation fails, by the Magistracy of Labour. As a legal consequence of this principle, strikes and lock-outs are forbidden by law and are legal offences.

The object of all this is to regulate the conditions of labour. But it is clear that a syndicalist order thus established, while arranging for the relations of the syndicates which are distinct from one another yet united into their categories, did not arrange for the equally essential coordination of all the categories grouped in federations and confederations, in order to obtain equal conditions of labour and the even more important unitary organization of all forces of production, consequently, national production itself.

It was a grave problem, yet the coordination of all the recognized syndicalist forces was attained by the creation of the National Corporative Council, an organism whose tasks are closely connected with the character of the corporative function.

This function must be kept in mind before we outline the tasks mentioned above. If the State had not foreseen, as far back as the publication of the law of April 3rd, 1926, the need for coordinating agencies between the associations of employers and workers, and if, afterwards, in the regulations for the application of the same law, it had not given them the name of corporations [guilds], it could not have called itself a corporative State. The recognition of the syndicates, the legal institution of collective contracts, that of the Magistracy of Labour, the legal prohibition of strikes and lock-outs, while being achievements profoundly original, and much to the credit of a political regime, could not certainly have given to the Fascist State that peculiar character which differentiates it from every other State. Its composition would have been exclusively syndicalist and nothing more.

The distinction, therefore, between syndicalism and corporativism, although one is completed by the other, is clear and profound, and to neglect it would be a source of

equivocation and of misunderstanding. It is a distinction both of organs and functions. While the recognized syndicalist associations are "juridical persons," the corporations [guilds], on the other hand, are organs of State administration. So, while the syndicalist function is strictly connected with the syndicates, the corporative function belongs only to the State. By its corporative activity the State acquires a new and typical function which, though it may seem to be a part of its administrative function, yet constitutes at least a very special phase of it.

The recent law of the National Corporative Council was the object of important and lively discussions before the two Houses of Parliament, in the last sittings of March. That which took place in the Chamber of Deputies was almost exclusively syndicalist, and centred chiefly around the question of the number of representatives each category was to have in the body of the Council and its sections with particular reference to the problem of the equality of relations between the syndicates and the National Council, and with some reference to the syndicalist autonomy or autarchy. In the Senate, the debate tackled two questions which might almost be called the two unknown quantities in the constitution of the Council: that is to say, the position of this organ in the constitutional system and its relations with the other constitutional organs of the State. The powers assigned to the Council in economic matters were also examined, its eventual relations with the corporative economy, the effects which the action of the Council would produce on the national economy, and the general outlines of all the political economy of Fascism.

Two questions were proposed to the Chamber, and of these one was proposed again to the Senate: Can the Corporative Council formulate regulations which are contradictory to the existing laws of the State? In the future, will Parliament be able to issue laws regulating collective economic relations among the various categories of producers, or relations between employers and workers? The answer cannot be other than negative for the

first question and affirmative for the second. Such questions might have had some meaning at the time of the discussion of the law of January, 1926, which dealt with the problem of the regulations between the executive power and the legislative power; but they were not raised then, nor when the constitutional character of emergency decrees (*Decreti Legge*) was treated. The principle of the superiority of the legislative regulations over other juridical regulations was never questioned by Fascism, because it responds to the essential need of every legal organization, namely, the definition of its agencies. The idea of a conflict between these agencies is repugnant to the Fascist conception of the State, considered as an organic unity. As the syndicate disciplines professional activities in view of the national interests, and the corporation [guild] disciplines the relations between category and category in view of those interests for which it is constituted, so the National Council disciplines the interests of the categories with a view to the national prosperity, while Parliament, finally, intervenes in view of the political interests of the nation.

Neither can all the interpretations of the corporation [guild] in the economic order be accepted. Both from extreme corporativists and from the guardians of private initiative come some errors of interpretation. The National Council should, according to them, represent the advent of a new economic regime, the regime of corporative economy. But this economy was born with the law of April 3, 1926, if by corporative economy one means the economic regime advocated by Fascism. It has existed since the time when Fascism, renouncing the attitude of State indifference to economic facts, assumed the function of regulator of the economic life of the nation.

On the other hand, an impartial examination of Fascist legislation on syndicalism dissipates the fear of those who dread the suffocation of individual economy. Some provisions of the law, in fact, represent in a certain sense not an amplification, but a limitation, of State action in economic matters. One can then

tranquilly refute the opinion of those who see in corporative economy a regime for stabilizing prices. And to dispel every doubt, an examination of the law ought to suffice, especially as regards the composition and the functioning of the Council. It is clear that the Council's field of activity is exclusively that of the categories of producers represented in it: both workers and employers, under the guidance of the Head of the Government, the high regulator of national interests.

Also paragraph 3 of article 12 of the bill prefacing the regulation of collective economic relations, has given rise to the erroneous statement that the Council, in carrying out this function, adopts provisions as delegate of the interested associations. Now it must be remembered that if these associations have the power to make regulations about collective relations of labour, they have none at all over the regulation of collective economic relations. They cannot then delegate faculties which they do not possess; those faculties belong, instead, to the Corporations [guilds].

These faculties belong, instead, to the Corporations [guilds]. These faculties can be exercised only after the decisions of the syndicalist associations which express the will of the producers, and thus are not the expression of a coercive will of the Council. Thus a real economic self-discipline under the laws of the State is attained: the individual interest operates through the will of the professional associations, the interest of the professional associations through the corporations [guilds], the interest of the corporations [guilds] through the Council. Here is in fact an economic hierarchy by means of which every desire is realized through the one immediately above it. This organization is that which responds most perfectly to modern tendencies in economic matters. The Fascist State does not intervene in business matters, but coordinates them on common lines. And it is a conception that reverses the ideas of socialist theory and at the same time transcends those of the liberal system.

In conclusion: the Fascist State may be denned as a State of syndicalist composition and corporative function, since as a truly sovereign State, it seeks to be adequate to the civil society which makes up its structure, and as a State with aims of its own, distinct from those of civil society, it has as its permanent object, to create, by means of its own action, and to achieve the moral, political, and economic unity of the Italian nation.

This being its character, the Fascist State solves the crisis in which the modern State is struggling. The reconstruction of the State on a solid basis could only take place by the elimination of the long-standing disagreement which was its bane, and by the imposition of order on the economic forces which threatened its existence. Only the corporative principle which affirms the ethical-political will of the State, and the dignity as well as the political legitimacy of economic interests, could inspire this reconstruction, since the preeminence of the State is not the dead weight of an authority which avails itself of its power and legal weapons, but is the preeminence of the ethical will which does not consider social forces from without, but penetrates into them, brings them into itself, and so gives concrete and true value both to the State and to social forces, both to politics and to economy.

Accurate investigation and careful study tell us that modern history is tending to the corporative conception of the State, to the inclusion of economy in the State, to the identification of politics with economics. But one might ask why it is in Italy, where economic forces were less powerful and less highly developed than elsewhere, that the need for facing and solving the problem has been felt? The question is interesting and it is that which has obliged us to define the historical meaning of Fascist corporativism, that is, its significance in Italian life, leading us to recognize the identity of the Fascist State and the corporative State.

Fascism is the maturing of the unitary spirit of the Italians, the forming of that unitary political conscience which is the true basis of the State. Ever since the territorial unification of 1870, the State had been regarded by the citizens as alien to them, not only by the working classes,—who, therefore became an easy prey to socialist doctrinaires—but also by the middle classes, who produced the leaders of the socialist movement. But with the Fascist Revolution, the State has become the rule, the limit, the guide of the Italians in the realization of their ends.

The weak political conscience, due to the recentness of the unification of the State, and the difficulties of our economic life, gave us special reason to fear the dangers inherent in the contradictory structure of the modern State. Fascism, therefore, in giving the Italians the State which is the true expression of their national personality, has, by the genius and intuition of Benito Mussolini, constructed a State which satisfies all the exigencies of modern life. A Fascist State which should gather together all the forces and all the tendencies of national life and direct them towards the ideal of power which inspired the Revolution, could be no other than the State which reflects the living conscience of the people, which holds the threads of all social life, which is present in every aspect of social life, which brings together and orders all forces and all interests: such a State could be no other than the corporative State, a noble reality which advances towards the secure future of the country.

Tradition and Revolution

Published in Gerarchia, 1931

Antonio Bruers

In a recent polemic, there was a key issue that was touched upon and which may be dealt with here without entering into the merits of the already exhausted discussions. The issue is this: what is the relationship of a revolutionary regime with the past of the nation where the revolution itself has been effectuated? Must a revolutionary regime, as a radical palingenesis, consider its action and its mission as clearly cut off from the past, or can and should it be considered tied in continuity with the previous era? There is no shortage of people who believe they can adequately respond with a simple yes or a simple no, but the question deserves to be examined in its true complexity.

First of all, before resolving the problem from the point of view of the revolution, it is necessary to clarify the values and historical laws of the nation, which here we can also consider as synonymous with the state.

The state is distinguished from individuals and entities which compose it precisely because the characteristic of its existence is above and beyond the individual. The individual as a citizen is mortal; the state is immortal; therefore the state is, or will be, an element of the continuity of the nation.

A state which does not feel itself to be the continuity of previous generations is unable to create a long and fruitful future. It is sufficient to take a cursory glance at history to realize that the kingdoms and empires which were the most enduring were the ones which had the most profound sense of origins, of

tradition, and which identified and respected the laws of their ancestors.

When a great barbarian poet said of the Romans that they were building for the future, he alluded, implicitly, to a sense of historical continuity with those ancient fathers, the highest expression of which—the Law—had, in fact, as its foundation, the essential principle of conservation, that is to say tradition. Nor, to comfort the assumption, is it necessary to cite the example of the British Empire, which, even if it had no other similarities with the Roman Empire, it provides at least one certainty: that of having continuously created new laws and new customs in continuity with the most ancient laws and ancient customs.

Withholding the axiomatic providentiality of conservation, must it therefore be concluded that a revolution does not have its rights? Of course not. The summary solutions of the problem which I presented at the beginning, arise from an incorrect setting of the theme.

In reality, the problem is not to ask whether a revolution must radically deny the past—the whole past (which is absurd, because a giant Tamerlane could destroy all the monuments, all the works, all the writings of the past, but it would never be able to destroy all the human brains, in which the past exists together with spirits identical to those geological layers). The real problem is to ask what in the past must be abolished in order to make a place for the creations of the future.

In the long history of a race, of a nation, of a state, there are alternate periods of grandeur and decadence, of truth and error, just as in the same way—and, perhaps, thanks to the same law for which there exists in the sky light and darkness and the nature of spring and winter—there exists birth and death.

It can be said that the chief problem of a revolutionary regime consists in determining what precisely in the past has to be

destroyed and what needs to be preserved. You can err in destroying too much, but you can also err in keeping too much. Being able to select from the mortal past and the immortal past, finding the right balance and creation, is the paragon of the statesmen who instituted a revolutionary era from their breasts. If many conservative regimes fell due to wanting to preserve too much, it is just as true that too many revolutionary regimes were unable to last due to wanting to destroy too much. These theoretical premises would be far easier if I were not using them to report a practical application with relation to Fascism.

Fortunately for us, Fascism constitutes a clear demonstration of the mentioned historical law: it is etched deeply into the life of the nation precisely because the Duce has been able to add up and merge into it—with beautiful harmony and profound equilibrium—the various spirits which intertwined to form it, and the mentalities that are often antagonistic, as he beautifully said recently: adverse but not distant.

While in the social sphere Fascism presents users with a modern direction, in the field of national spirituality it recalls the greatness, norms and traditions of old. Not only does it not reject the Italy of Cavour and Garibaldi, but it is reconnected with it.

The fusion of the various and seemingly-opposing tendencies—imperialism and corporativism, recognition of Catholic values and the doctrine of the totalitarian state—is so fundamental so as to confuse our opponents who have not yet solved the problem of whether Fascism must be fought as reactionary or as revolutionary.

Once it is established that Fascism has not rejected the sense of continuity with the past and solidarity with previous generations, one should not conclude that it has accepted all of the past and all of the doings of previous generations. Here there is an obvious, though small, historical fracture marked by the March on Rome, and followed by a work of selection, especially

sensible in their dealings with the historical period from the Risorgimento proper (1870) to May 1915, or, if you prefer, to October 1922.

Fascism constitutes a radical reaction against the spirit and forms of the Italy of Depretis, Giolitti and Nitti. This is its strength and this is its pride. But this does not mean that Fascism, while creating a solution of continuity, has repudiated all the recent past. Even when it invoked revolutionary intransigence against the so-called Umbertine regime, it must not be thought that because of this we should repudiate the whole of Italy in the fifty years before Fascism.

Because not everyone in Italy during the regimes of Depretis, Giolitti and Nitti was Depretian, Giolittian and Nittian; because even if there was timidity in foreign policy, there were also irredentists and nationalists; because even if there was a lack of a sense of expansion, there were still those brave martyrs of colonialism; because even if there was a populace which vegetated miserably on home soil, there was also the organized and conscious masses who responded to the call of material and ideal solidarity, in the name of a latent rejuvenation; and if there was an Italy finally disposed towards neutrality, there was also an Italy which knew how to impose the 24th of May (declaration of war on Austria-Hungary); because if there was an Italy which displayed the fear of hunger, there was also an Italy which responded with the March on Ronchi.

In the secular life of a state there is no reason for a total repudiation of an historical epoch, but perhaps only good reasons for the rejection of a ruling class. There is no moment in history, no matter how humble and cowardly, that is not accompanied by men who redeem—for the sake of the children—the humility and cowardice of the moment. And these are the men to whom the children should relate, these are the men whom the next generation must consider as the legitimate representatives of the nation facing the future. Fascism, rather

than linger to criticize Giolittian and Nittian Italy, must devote itself to illustrating and highlighting Italy's war in Libya, intervention in the Great War, the occupation of Fiume, and the March on Rome. There is a self-depreciating history from which we must guard against no less rigorously—that of empty chauvinistic arrogance. Porro unum est necessarium: salvage and raise the presence of our consciousness, even before the presence of foreigners, the sense of the historical continuity of the state, of the nation, of the race. Machiavelli, at the very moment in which he described Italy as "without a head, without order, beaten, stripped, tearful, running", at that moment he turned to the history of Rome, that is, to the past, to tradition, to prophesy and to prepare Italy for the future.

Fascist Civilization: The Civilization of the Spirit

Published in Gerarchia, July 1937

Niccolò Giani

For us Mystics Fascism is Mussolini and only Mussolini. This, even though we know and remember exactly what he said in 1921 when asked, "How then was Fascism born; amid what conflicting passions, sympathy, hatred, and lack of understanding? It was not only born from my mind or my heart, it was not born only by this meeting that we held in March 1919 in a small room in Milan. It was born of a profound, perennial need of this our Aryan and Mediterranean race..."

Fascism is not an instinct but an education, and therefore is aware of its mystique, which is knowledge of Mussolini. Look, for example, at the definition that he gave to the Revolution, determined in 'The Doctrine of Fascism': "...when a Finnish philosopher recently asked me to give him a sense of Fascism in one sentence, I wrote in German: "we are against the comfortable life."" Is this right here not the essence of the Revolution? Has not the comfortable life been the ideal of materialism? Have not Liberalism, Socialism and Communism arisen and fought in the name of individual hedonism?

Is not discomfort the symbol of the spirit of restlessness? Looking for new and better, the will of tomorrow, the desire of struggle, that is to say, of true progress? Therefore, with this definition Mussolini fixed the most important and most distinguishing attribute of Fascism: the Civilization of the Spirit. Indeed, how is it he can say:

"We represent the exact antithesis of the whole order of democracy, plutocracy, and Freemasonry, of all the immortal principles of 1789."

Is it not, perhaps, because Rousseau, Marx and Engels, although different in their attitudes, were all representatives and bearers of materialism? It is precisely for this reason that Mussolini, giving the right name to the last century, could write in 1922:

"All creations of the spirit — starting with religious ones — are coming to the fore, and nobody dare keep up the attitude of anti-clericalism which, for several decades, was a favourite of democracy in the Western world. By saying that God is returning, we mean that spiritual values are returning."

And it is because Fascism is the return of the spirit in the West, because it is the return of the values of the "Aryan and Mediterranean civilization", because it is the return of the true and Roman Catholic Europe, that Mussolini was able to affirm that "the idea, doctrine and spirit of Fascism is universal. It is Italian in its particular institutions, but it is universal in spirit; nor could it be otherwise." He was also able to declare that "Fascism has now acquired throughout the world that universality which belongs to all doctrines which, by achieving self-expression, represent a moment in the history of the human spirit."

The belief that "Fascism will be the model of Italian and European civilization of this century", is it not based on reality? Does it not rely on the fact that Fascism is the realization of what philosophers and artists of the past, and of this century, in every part of the world, have called for? May not the Revolution of the Blackshirts be the long-awaited historical nemesis? Is it not the triumph of all those schools, of all those currents which, in the age of materialism, have maintained the torch of the spirit and have continuously passed it down to a haggard but determined

minority, small but strong-willed, that in the world today has become the vast majority: Fascism, National Socialism, Rexism, Catholic and Corporative Austria, Salazar's Portugal, and Franco's Spain?

"From where comes wisdom? What is the origin of the force? It is through the thinking of men that the soul of God spreads throughout the world."

And so we arrived at the hour of crisis, what Mussolini called, "the crisis of the system". Now at this time the systems of matter have met with those of the spirit, the materialistic civilization is a struggle of life and death against the spiritualist civilization. That is, us, in recent years. We are at Moscow against Rome. We are at the bloody battle of Red Spain against Franco's Spain. Thus it is that we can say that today Fascism echos all the hopes and all the odds, all the trends and all movements, all schools and all the parties that for a century and a half, in our old world and in the new America, have kept the torch of the spirit and fought for its triumph. And so Mussolini is champion not only of the Italic people, but of the whole human world and the eternal forces of the spirit, echoing the forerunners of yesterday and the combatants of today who under all latitudes are engaged in this same battle because Victory will become commonplace.

For Orestano just as for Dainelli, for Charles Petrie as for Christopher Danyson, for De Reynold as for Thaddeus Zielinski, for Weber, for Grzybowski, for Manóiesco, for Karl Anton Rohan, Garcia Morente, Francesco Coppola, Alfred Rosenberg, Gimenez Caballero, Bodrero, J. Rennell, Pierre Gaxotte, Tucci, Daniel Halévy, Orario, von Beckerath, Apponyi, André Gervais, Georges Valois, etc., is not the civilization of the Fasces (Littorio) really — in spite of everything — the beginning of the implementation of their visions and their dreams, their advances and their meditations?

That's why in today's world we are talking about two mysticisms. On the one hand the mystique of Rome, which is

the mystical spirit, behind which are aligned forces who believe and fight in the name of European tradition, in the name of "Aryan and Mediterranean" civilization; Catholicism and Fascism, National Socialism and Rexism, the Austria of Dollfuss and Schuschnigg, Salazar's Portugal and Franco's Spain. The other is the mysticism of materialism, the so-called civilization of gold, one that has revived the myth of the bull, which repeats the fate of the Phoenician merchant and Carthage, which continues for 1789 and 1917, behind which flag, red with blood and sacrifices, stands united the arrogant and Communist Russia of Stalin, the France of Blum, and the England of the Masons and Jews. Fascist Civilization is the Civilization of the spirit: that is the great truth of the century. The truth that foreigners, those who do not know us or fight us in good faith, have not yet understood. For them, in fact, we have been and are still violence and reaction, dictatorship and right-wing, but they failed to understand that the bludgeon and castor oil are as sacrosanct as the Crusades, that reaction was not regression but involution and a return to the eternal values of the Mediterranean tradition, that dictatorship was not satrapism but the restoration of the State, that the Right is not harassment and negation of the proletariat but instead exaltation of work which is hierarchy, discipline, ingenuity, technique, tenacity. And it is the spirit, and from this fundamental initial position of the Revolution descends, in perfect harmony, all other principles of Fascism, all those indisputable points that together constitute the "Mystical Fascist". Is not the spirit faith, will, and action? That is why Mussolini, against atheism, moral fatalism and historical determinism, and against the irresponsibility and cowardice of materialism has launched the three words "believe, obey and fight". Is not the spirit harmony, hierarchy of values and fairness? It is in this name that the Duce proclaimed "order, authority, justice" against the chaos of egalitarianism, the anarchy of universal embraces, and the gouge of the strong over the weak, venerated by materialism.

And so Mussolini said that the "state is an absolute before which individuals and groups are relative", and yet "all within the State, nothing outside the State, nothing against the state." But this is not statolatry because the Duce also said: "Valuing the individual", though not individualism. Knowing the 'Pensiero di Mussolini', the equation of Fascism with Spirit is indisputable... That's why its pages will assist many foreigners, and also not a few Italians who, in the Year XV of the Fascist Era and Year II of the Empire, still believe that fascism is just a good political regime and nothing more. However, the youth of the world knows — or will know — that in the symbols of the Cross, of the Aquila, and of the Fasci hath been reincarnated the Mediterranean civilization that, in the name of Latin and Catholic Rome, created the Europe of yesterday, and today, in the name of the Littorio, it must restore the continent to its tradition and to the task that is assigned in the life of our little Earth. But — let us remember — only in the thought and action of the Duce is the Doctrine of Fascism, and in it is fully synthesized and expressed the Civilization of the spirit: to know and make known this thought and action is therefore the watchword of the youth of Mysticism and, we are certain, not only of them.

Romanity and Latinity: Response to Transalpine Ideologues

Published in Gerarchia, March 3, 1938

Massimo Scaligero

The division that Communism has caused among the Latin peoples, who historically can be regarded as linked by a single ideal bond despite the apparent contrasts and struggles arising from political and territorial disagreements, is a new fact in contemporary history: the division, in fact, has now become a very deep division rooted in the forces of the spirit: it is a fracture of consciences, it is a separation between two worlds that have become strangers to each other: the democratic, socialist and parliamentary idea on the one side, and the Fascist idea on the other: on one side the Communist principle, and on the other the principle of order and hierarchy.

However, in relation to this division, some rhetoricians from the other side of the Alps have begun to misinterpret the meaning of "Latinity", which they have invoked as a form of traditional conscience, as if it could stand alone and be divorced from its Roman inspiration. Additionally, the article by the French academic Rosny Jeune recently appeared in *Lea nouvelles litteraires*, in which he asserts that "despite Rome and the Germans, France today is still Gaul". This was in response to the question posed by Marius-Ary Leblond in the historical-polemical work *Vercingetorix*, concerning the relationship between the French of today and the Gauls conquered by Caesar.

First of all, the concept of Gaul itself can not be conceived except as a world conquered and civilized by the Romans. But apart from the purely historical aspect of the matter, we are

interested in examining some of these particularistic and naive Gallic interpretations, masked by the philosophy of civilization. According to some French ideologues, the history of the West would present certain aspects of evolution and revolution, particularly concerning the Latin populations: such aspects would be flatly at odds with the spirituality of those who claim to possess a Latin and Roman culture in the original "orthodox" sense of the term. According to them, the French Revolution, that class struggle created by the democracies, and Spanish Communism, would all be phenomena which, in terms of space, race and nationality, can only be considered Latin; in fact — it is argued — they express a sort of insurgent force of harmony proper to Latin spirituality, since they tend to re-establish a balance that was previously violated by the principle of authority, and violated today by Fascism and National Socialism. Those policies and that culture which today emanates from Rome would therefore be outside of Latin tradition, that is to say, it would represent a return to the harsher and more militaristic form of Romanism.

One should begin by asking these gentlemen what they mean by "tradition" and by "Latinity" and what cultural deficiency should this contrived distinction between "Latin" and "Roman" be, whose substance is like their entire theoretical and political system: mere dialectic. But today there are still those who are moved by dialectical motives and believe in that rhetoric that can be the conceptual justification for certain degenerations in life. What is tradition for them? Perhaps historical heritage, lexicology, university culture, perhaps philosophy? Unfortunately words are too often played with, to such an extent that it is possible to make them lose their real meaning; on the other hand, ignorance also plays tricks on brilliant journalists and learned philosophers.

This is not the most suitable place to begin clarifying that the authentic Western tradition is only one and it cannot be anything other than the Roman tradition, since after the Roman

Empire no other universal idea illuminated the face of the West, which is but a partial resurrection of that which derived from Rome. After that, what other higher ideal of civilization has united people spiritually and temporally? Perhaps the scientific and philosophical rhetoric of the humanist period, which is also an emanation of the "Italic spirit"? Perhaps the French revolution? Or perhaps Bolshevism? It would also be necessary to specify the extent to which Roman spirituality has inspired every permanent expression of organic construction of both the intellect and the warrior spirit in Europe, even in periods of decadence. Indeed, many highbrows should be taught how, unlike all psychic complexes, mental forms and philosophical modes known to them, that is to say, unlike a world of absolute "contingency", the intimate character of tradition is perennality, so that it does not die, but is hidden, in periods in which its external action seems to stop: its essence is spiritual and ritual, its custom is virile and hierarchical, its principle esoteric and necessitating; its action has an imperial constructive motive and its motive is to be found among the scenes of history, behind the most decisive events, behind the great conquests of peoples, certainly not in bookish collections nor through cold, arid morphological examination. Explaining the meaning of the Roman tradition to those who do not know it and do not want to understand it would be a long task; however, it would be a great step in the right direction if they at least began to understand that it is not the one to which they dialectically refer to.

For its unequivocal and universal sense, Tradition is above any sectarian dialectic: it does not shrink in different aspects, but includes every aspect: being Western and Roman, it also gives meaning to Latinity. By virtue of the strength of superior individuals and by fatal necessity, Rome always remains the center of the majestic cycle of struggles and triumphs of the West: its virtue of irradiation of spiritual energies and its function as the source of every organizing current in Europe

have, above all, symbolic value, both with respect to the value of determining space (which is precisely one of the arguments used by the defenders of that bastard "Latinity"), and with respect to the virtual progressivity of time: in other words, an essence is not superior insofar as it spatially originated from Rome, but inasmuch as it emanated from the soul of Rome: what is great is Roman, not rhetorically, but because, in relation to an indestructible Western ethic, collateral, as a correspondent manifestation, to the secret and dominant Mediterranean tradition, it cannot help but be inspired by Rome with its characteristics of precision, shaping potentiality, constructive will.

The Latin unity of peoples was a powerful creation brought about by Rome: it would not have existed, it would not have had the strength of amalgamation and luminous fruitfulness if the secret virtue of the imperium, translated into a framework of actions, more pontificali and the strength of the warrior tradition, had not given the West its physiognomy: without the necessitative and metaphysical solemnity of "fatal things", objects of veneration inherited from a god or from the god-like power of the ancient Mediterranean cities, without the possession of a secret name that linked a divine force to the destiny of Rome, without the propitiation of supernatural intelligences performed by the priests, the flamens and the Pontifex Maximus, without the mystery ceremonies, without the sacrificial action and the ritual on the eve of great wars and decisive battles, without the presence of a heroic warrior-genius who becomes the inspiration of every Roman event — all of these elements, components of the great weave of authentic tradition — one could have never spoken of a Latin tradition, nor of a Latin spirituality, nor of neo-Latin languages, as signs of the persistence of Latin culture.

The condition of Latinity therefore emanates from Rome: every time that Latinity is detached from the Roman tradition, it returns to barbarism: we believe this to be the case of today's Communism in the Latin nations. On the other hand, the

existence of a Latin thought is not particular merely to a new experience, but an aspect related to the absolute permanence of a Roman spirituality. The essence of Latinity is the heritage of a tradition that remains the same, alien to all the degenerations of races that also had the gift of its light: this is useful to fix once and for all.

The authentic Latin virtues are not casual emanations of forces connected to human and contingent goals, they cannot be detached from a "metaphysical" plan of action where sterile dialectical and materialistic controversies cease to have meaning: they act for a power that has a super-temporal and super-nationalistic character, that is to say for an organizational power identical to that which Rome adopted in order to unify and harmonize the whole West with an integrative morality and with a healthy body of laws. Deprived of this super-material sense, that is, outside a Roman tradition, Latinity is no longer such, it is degeneration: it can also become Spanish Communism or French subversion.

Another of the errors common to those historians beyond the Alps who not only ignore the existence of an esoteric tradition of Rome, but also attempt to devalue the meaning of its imperiality, is to believe that the Roman conquest halted the natural development of ancient Celtic civilization, which they think could have made France a great Nation towards the second century. Now, apart from the clumsiness of these forms of historical fantasy, to avoid falling into such a bogus error it is sufficient to take into account that at the time when Caesar conquered Gaul, this people had already given all it could give. Indeed, even according to the opinion of those same authors who support the notion that Western spirituality originated in the North, they admit that the Celtic spirit at that time was in its final phase, so that this race no longer appeared to be the repository of a higher tradition, but returned to primitive forms of culture. A series of positive elements could be reported to attest to the decay of the Celtic spirit at the time of the Roman

advent: since the limited space does not permit us to delineate, it is enough to recall that Caesar tasked with the defense of Gaul due to the Germanic invasions and that it was a Gallic poet — with expressions of enthusiastic gratitude — who raised praises to Rome, which had redeemed the entire West with its civilization.

To seek to deny a spirituality in Rome means to deny its own history which is elementarily and outwardly known by everyone: it is enough to go back to the determining cause to arrive at a high system of ideals that were not only political and warlike, but superhuman and transcendent. Precisely because of its superior tradition, Rome was able to affirm its way of life among peoples through warrior custom, not limited by a materialistic vision of the world, but implemented in view of a superhuman plan to be conquered.

The greatest error regarding the misconception about Roman spirituality is attributable to most historians, who are concerned only with finding the organicity and continuity of a series of facts, details, dates and names, for the exclusive purpose of compiling a meticulous exhumation of events. But the meaning of these has been lost: what they meant and emanated, the ritual power, the secret action, the intimate motive of every initiative and of every conquest, are no longer understood: there is only a legacy of words and the illusion of having been able to reconstruct the essence of "Romanità" through annals, chronicles, epigraphs and ruins.

The task of reconstructing the history of Rome implies not only the need for a definitive demonstration of the perennial spiritual reference of all warlike action, but also the identification of a "Roman tradition" whose form is knowable only through super-storical communion, of a psychological nature, with a cycle of culture in its own right, by virtue of an inner dignity completely foreign to the academic spirit and beyond simple university erudition.

Finally, it will never be sufficiently remembered by the peddlers of these ideas that the limited development of art and philosophy is a natural fact in a civilization that is ascending, since its action, to be fully such, remains faithful to superior principles of the spirit that constitute the essence of its Tradition, nor does it become entangled in cultural formulas, but tends to implement a system of life, in the act of a higher state of life to be reached through every act: which constitutes the highest form of spirituality, above any rhetoric or abstract conceptions. Rome, in this sense, is once again a teacher, when it teaches how, above all, to import that masculine and realizing way of life which is the manifestation of an inner vitality at work, a synthesis of spirituality and action, and which leads to the effective realization of an imperial regime, after which, in fullness of power, the civilizers can devote themselves to that first art form adhering to action and inspired by a sense of "necessity" which is architecture. It is evident that if the Romans had begun by being philosophers and artists, they would have left us merely a bookish legacy, nor would they have had the power to unify a continent, nor would they have been the custodians of that Tradition which lived as they ritually acted and won. They translated into weaves of strength and imperishable harmonies what was transmitted to them from above by natural virtue: a superior fate whose action proved imperious and ineluctable, whose constant signs in stone and in buildings, as in the soul of the people, absolutely excludes that this was due to a series of external combinations or to mere brute force.

If it is true that during the cycle of Rome no constructions of the aesthetic-philosophical soul emerged, as in Hellas, such as Platonic idealism, the metaphysics of Aristotle, the works of Praxiteles, the medicine of Hippocrates, the astronomical insights by Aristarchus of Samos, the dialectic of Diodorus Cronus; it is, however, undeniable that it was precisely through the spirit of essentially Roman universality that Greek culture

spread in the West, acquiring a didactic-doctrinal character to which imperial Rome attached a certain educational importance.

Roman spirituality, on the other hand, had a more active unifying force than that of a simple culture, when Rome — in order to redeem the irrational impulse of the very life of the subjugated barbarians — conferred upon them legislative bodies which still exist today in Europe, and made it understood that to be governed by Rome is a civil privilege, a coveted prize. Moreover, to give a wide breath of life to the vanquished peoples, it raised great architectural monuments in their countries, erected temples renowned for art and for the divinities to which they were consecrated, opened vast avenues of communication to international trade, protected work and the economy, aroused that organic order which gave rise to the "immense peace" that Pliny the Elder exalted, expressing the wish that "the good of Roman civilization would be made eternal, bringing new light into the world".

Woman in the Fascist State

Published in Critica fascista, February 15, 1939

Adolfo Dolmetta

The inspiration for this article was provided a few days ago by the announcement of the Littoriali of Culture and Art for the year 1939, in which we found — alongside the male competitions — also that of the female Littoriali, dictated by the political and disciplinary maturation already reached for some time now by the Young University Fascists organized within the female ranks of the GUF.

This manifestation, marked by that sense of politicity and spirituality that inspires all the manifestations of the Regime, evokes the study of the mission and of the essentially spiritual tasks that women have assumed in the body of the State and of the Regime after sixteen years of revolution, with special reference to the three most topical subjects: Empire, Race and Autarky.

But to properly set and solve the problem we believe it is necessary first of all to fix to these arguments the natural presupposition, that is, to outline the principles that Fascist ethics has in regards to woman's human, social and legal position. With this we also have to touch upon a fresh wound, an open wound, namely female susceptibility in light of the measures of the Council of Ministers reducing the employment of the women workers.

The Fascist conception of life is essentially a moral conception: the life of the Fascist must be high and full, lived for himself but above all for others, distant and close, present and future. In the face of arid and selfish individual calculation there

is the evaluation of collective and national interests, considered as an ethical end, that is, as the ultimate end for the activities of all individuals and all groups living within the State: this therefore becomes the limit and norm of every individual right, the criterion for evaluating private interests and impulses.

By applying these principles to the female problem, it follows — as a logical corollary — that Fascist ethics precludes the step that leads to Feminism, i.e. that morbid and unhealthy phenomenon that can be summarized as an emancipation of the individual-female so as to be perfectly equal to the emancipated individual-male. Dating back to other times, but spreading rapidly only at the beginning of this present century, partially as a consequence of the World War which for a long time removed the man from business and from the home, thereby allowing the woman to assume the role in both places, Feminism presents itself as the celebration of an individual autonomy that would make woman capable of dictating to herself and by herself all the forms of her work and her life in a clearly selfish and hedonistic vision of existence. It is sufficient, after all, to bear in mind the more easily identifiable manifestations of Feminism: working outside the home, even in jobs that are not physically or morally appropriate for women, most often — if not always — for the sake of monetary gain in order to live comfortably; aspiring towards the most absolute masculinization which is summed up in a presumption of equality of rights and abilities between women and men, which is exalted in the practice of "sports" which are even less appropriate for feminine grace; it is reflected in a stupid mimicry (physical and mental) which undermines sensible modesty and tramples upon virtue; and finally the desire to establish with man not that conjugal life which brings about the "boredom" of motherhood and the "burdens" of a legal bond, but rather a society of enjoyment and pleasure, with equal reciprocal conditions, more or less prolonged in time and space.

Fascism has reacted against this conception since its emergence, reaffirming and exalting the virtues and graces that

truly honor the woman, diverting her away from those sexual deviancies which women clumsily engage in with pride in those democratic republics which offer the most evident proof of their degeneracy in the progressive softening of the men. Solid evidence of Fascism's struggle against Feminism can be seen in the creation of the National Agency of Maternity and Infant Welfare, which has gradually entered into greater harmony with the spirit and needs of the demographic policy; in the new penal laws for crimes against public morality and decency, crimes against the integrity and health of the race and crimes against the family; in the celebration of "Mother and Child Day", which is a profoundly humane and Christian exaltation of motherhood; in the removal of women from those jobs and positions which turned her into a bundle of nerves, searching in vain for an increasingly unsatisfactory form of seduction.

Fascism wants to ban from national life the heirs and disciples of Olympe de Gouges and Claire Lacombe, who in 1793 presented women's rights to the Paris Commune, proclaiming that those who have the right to mount the scaffold also have the right to mount the rostrum; and there is no place in our Regime for the followers of George Sand, who demanded the right of women to sexual emancipation, nor for people like Oda Olberg and Wally Zepler, through whom the Feminist movement — after initially infiltrating the political and economic fields — has now invaded the moral field, having as its ultimate goal the negation of marriage and motherhood, which they regard as social obstacles "to the full development of woman's personality".

Against the two types of modern and international woman — the wealthy woman with hedonistic anti-housewife behaviours who, with her luxurious jewels and clothes, causes enormous sums of Italian money to pour into other countries each year; and the poor working woman of the workshops, stores and offices who despises both manual labour and house work, i.e. that work which is more properly feminine — our doctrine

exalts the Fascist woman, who is a woman in the full sense of the word, i.e. first and foremost a mother, whose task is not to escape motherhood but to procreate and raise the children to have strong and healthy sentiments towards the Fatherland; whose battle post — because in revolutionary regimes even women have a battle post — is not the office or the factory, but the home, which is conceived as the sacred temple in which the woman can and must ennoble both herself and those who live around her, fulfilling the high mission that nature and social life have entrusted to her. And if we want to further specify the characteristics of the Fascist woman, we can also add that she is a genetically healthy woman who, with her life force and her moral heritage, compensates for her husband's inherited and acquired defects; and she is a frugal woman, rejecting especially those luxury goods that are imported from abroad.

Thus in our conception the woman finds the fullness of her existence not in concentrating foolishly on herself, but in projecting her personality outside of herself; not in seeking herself in herself, but in those that come to life and spring from her; in orienting her life, her thought, her will, in short all her energies, not towards herself, but outside and above herself: only in this way does the woman position herself as a faithful collaborator of the Regime, a precious and irreplaceable element for national solidarity. In this way she truly becomes the center of irradiation of goodness, of sacrifice, of order, of love, of harmony, of pride, of all those noble and strong feelings that make the Fatherland great and strong.

That this result is achievable — that is, that every Italian woman can acquire this notion of her function and this sense of her mission — is easily demonstrated by the recent history she partook in: from the anti-sanctionist reaction to fervent collaboration in the autarkic sphere, to the many and extensive outreach activities carried out in the various social sectors, accompanied by an intelligent and industrious understanding. The tools for such a work exist and are very valid: namely the

Female Fascist Leagues, a superb expression of strength and love emitting from the activity of the Party, through which the Italian woman, while remaining a woman, refines her spirit and temperament, always adapting her action directly to the high ideals of the great machine of the Regime.

And when this concept is universally accepted and implemented, our woman — of every class and culture, of every age and every position — will realize the full beauty of her proper duties; she will be able to bring the sober virtues of her femininity to every battle; she will be able to participate in the life of the Nation in silence and in modesty, losing none of that sense of balance and that love of the household which undoubtedly constitute a motive for the divine richness of the family; above all she will understand the greatness of a life made entirely of silence and austerity both for the times in which we live and for those that await us.

And then she will be able to understand how the sums saved by surrendering posts to fathers of families and by eliminating expenses used on makeup, cigarettes and hair dye, which all serve to further delay wrinkles and the age of "mandatory virtue", will instead serve to give men and soldiers to the Fatherland; she will be able to understand that the only action of the woman is the child and that she does not need an organization, and that for real women there is only one female "sport": love, and only one goal: motherhood.

And it is precisely because of this superior conception of feminine life that our moral principle — unlike the Marxist and socialist system of masculinization which, instead of elevating the woman, as it delusionally believes, makes her more enslaved to her natural and physiological differences —, by calling woman back to her proper tasks, function and mission, elevates her above contingency and instability and makes her rise to the level of heroic overcoming of herself, for the life, future and happiness of others.

Words to the Young

Published in Gerarchia, March 1940

Ettore Muti

School is the sacred place where the Fatherland, Religion, and Family are fulfilled, in marvelous unity, since it is necessary to provide Italy with men nourished in faith, ready to obey, and determined to fight.

Training the muscles is not an end in itself. Thus there is no formal education for its own sake. There is an education of the spirit through the education of the muscles. The sportsman is only complete if his physical improvement causes him to achieve moral improvement through greater self-confidence.

Our goal is clear: to prepare good soldiers that are, like the legionaries of Rome, vigorous and strong, courageous and disciplined, ready to kill and, if necessary, to die when the Duce commands. War veterans, you are the most capable of understanding that there is only a revolutionary Fascism, and that it is a Fascism which is active. There can not be a sedentary Fascism.

Consider in a special way the Roman step. It is a synthesis, not only of a complete and well-assimilated education, but also, and above all, a perfect framing of the spirit, of the most rigid discipline, and a more conscious camaraderie.

Religion, Philosophy and Fascism

Published in La Rassegna nazionale, 1942

Ugo Ciuchini

It has been said and repeated that Fascism is a religion and a faith; not in the proper meaning of the word, but in the sense that it may have the fervor, enthusiasm, spontaneous discipline and the heroic dedication of a faith.

And indeed Fascism took the gray dullness of Italian political life — that is, the field which was regarded as the most refractory — and infused into it the life-giving breath of spirituality, almost a powerful whiff of mysticism (which explains, among other things, its immediate and profound success).

Neither socialism nor popularism had managed to elevate the tone of Italian political life; the former due to the congenital absence of any spirituality, given its materialistic basis, and the latter, among other things, due to the spiritual aridity of their own leader [Don Sturzo] who, despite being a priest, did not understand the profound aspirations and immense reserves of spiritual energies of the Catholic masses who voted for the Italian People's Party, creating a rapid, but short-lived power; he had aimed only to make it a versatile instrument of parliamentary intrigue, losing himself in the contingent skirmish and unashamedly welcoming Jews and Freemasons — more or less sleeper agents — into his Party, thus implicitly renouncing the intimate Catholic essence.

But for Fascism, a movement of practical and concrete character, it was not sufficient to have a vague sense of religiosity; it was necessary for it to correspond to a religious conception of

life, a fundamental truth which constitutes the basis of the doctrine of Fascism.

The 'Doctrine of Fascism' affirms that "Fascism is a religious conception, in which man is viewed in his immanent relation to a higher law, endowed with an objective will which transcends the particular individual raises him to conscious membership of a spiritual society" and that "the Fascist conception of life is a spiritualistic conception, an ethical conception". A very important affirmation of principles.

There are as many religious conceptions of life as there are faiths; those which are spiritualistic are as numerous as the philosophies with spiritualistic address, beginning with the rationalism of Kant and the idealism of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, ending with the actual idealism of Giovanni Gentile, and finally the relativist and subjectivist idealism, which is synthesized in this staggering definition of truth: "truth is whatever one believes it to be." Even the ethical conceptions of life are as numerous as the philosophical conceptions. Varro, in his day, traced back a few hundred possible moral systems: those who place the foundation of morality in the pursuit of pleasure (Epicureans), those who abstain from pleasure (Stoics), those in pursuit of truth (Platonists).

Which of these faiths, spiritualistic and philosophical conceptions, and ethical doctrines is connected to the religiosity, spirituality and ethics of Fascism?

The Duce previously wrote: "I should like to see us create the philosophy of Italian Fascism." On the occasion of the opening of the Milanese school of propaganda and culture, he wrote a letter to the late Michele Bianchi in which he stated the necessity for Fascism to give itself a body of doctrine; and it is not possible to have a body of doctrine without relating it to a conception of life, that is, a philosophy.

But to which of these various philosophical doctrines, which throughout the centuries have succeeded one another like the waves of a moving ocean, from those of Hellas to those of the modern and contemporary era, often in opposition to each other, does the philosophy of Fascism base its foundation on?

That issue was resolved once and for all in February 1929, with the signing of the Lateran Treaty, in which the first article proclaims that the Italian State is a Catholic State: "which is perfectly natural in a Catholic people such as ours, and under a Regime like the Fascist one" (Mussolini).

A State which professes itself to be Catholic must also recognize the truth about the religious doctrines banned by the Church and, consequently, must take into account, in all its logical inferences, divine revelation, the primary and essential foundation of Catholicism; thus Fascism has a general conception of life and the world which is not contrary to revealed truth.

On the other hand, if, as the Duce wrote, "the State is the conscience and the will of the Nation, the spirit is the will of the Nation", then logically it must have a religion, that is, the theology and morals of the Nation. Nor does its full adhesion to the Catholic religion violate the freedom, autonomy and sovereignty of the State, which indeed is confirmed, inasmuch as it makes free and reasonable use, accepting the dogmatic and ethical content of the Catholic religion which it considers "true" and therefore "beneficial to the State itself, for the "optimum" ethics which tends to be realized among the people."

Thus, "the doctrine of Fascism finds its fundamental basis in a general conception of life and the world, harmonizing with the Catholic view." Therefore it can not be connected to any philosophy which is not in harmony with Catholic faith and morals, which is not connected to the Creed and to Catholic morals.

And this philosophy can be no other than the traditional Italian philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, Vico, Rosmini, Gioberti. Since Fascism is an affirmation of national values, even in the field of philosophical speculation we must preserve our highest national physiognomy, connecting with the traditional currents of Italian philosophical thought.

It was observed by some that in Italy, where the vigor and originality of the intellectuals has never been lacking, that philosophy would become stagnant, because it is subservient to the Faith.

On the contrary, the practical and concrete Italian mentality, shaped by natural good sense (even the ancient Romans, who had healthy and sound minds), has never been abandoned to the strangest and most contradictory philosophical speculations, because, after elaborating, especially with Thomas Aquinas, the ultimate results which human genius had reached with the philosophy of Hellas, had laid the granite foundation of that philosophy "*universalis et perennis*", which is the philosophy of truth.

In front of our reasoned statement that the doctrine of Fascism (the unity of conscience of the New Italian can not allow within itself a contradiction between Faith and Philosophy) is connected to traditional Italian Catholic philosophy, the Pharisees who worship in the temple of modern philosophy were scandalized and tore their garments; the politicians and the sophistic commentators, still embroiled in Masonic laicism, smiled with an ambiguous skeptical grin, almost pityingly; but the righteous and truly thoughtful men who cared for the future of the Fatherland, those who desired to reinvigorate the Nation ever more in its intimate moral fiber and steadfast strength; those who, with genuine love, hope anxiously for the full spiritual, moral, civil revival, and the true greatness and political power of Imperial Italy, can do no other but nod in agreement with us.

We believe that the new civilization which Fascism prepares will be a new original stage of the Roman and Christian civilization, inserted into the mass of the new forces that characterize the current state of humanity.

We believe that Fascism, due to the gradual and natural course of its essence, will increasingly permeate the Roman spirit and Christian ethics, achieving, by this, the apogee of its greatness and its splendor, the primacy of its true greatness and power, as advocated by our greatest figures.

The inclusion of the Fascist conception of life into the Catholic philosophical system — which in fact has already been done, according to the inner logic of the historical development of Fascism — meets many fundamental principles of its doctrine, while saving the historical originality of Fascism, it does not prevent even the originality of further developments, because Fascist policy, while adhering to the fundamental principles of Christian ethics, retains all its autonomy and originality in its methods for achieving its own ends of the State.

The Roman and Christian tradition has given to Fascism the primary fundamentals of its doctrine, and thus derives its supreme values from supernatural and divine ethics, while the dynamic and heroic attitude of Fascism will not be without influence on Catholic life, indirectly bringing a contribution of new energy and life into traditional religiosity, which is often done merely out of habit and is sometimes polluted by a certain effeminacy, contrary to the true essence of Christianity, which is militia, spirit and life, up to the peak of holiness and heroism.

The Holy Crusade of Civilization Against Bolshevik Barbarism

Published in La Rassegna nazionale, 1941

Giulio de' Rossi dell'Arno

Latin and Germanic Europe, Europe of a thousand lives, Europe the immortal sacred flame of civilization, God bless you!

Europe; now more than ever in the centuries you are subject to the violence of the barbarians of the East and of the West, and always you will triumph with the energy of your civilizing dynamism, Europe perennial spring of the nations, God bless you.

And God has blessed you, O Latin and Germanic Europe, O daughter of the sun — of the material sun and of the spiritual sun —, God has blessed you because you are the reflection of His light over all the earth: in the matter which is renewed and in the spirit which is eternal.

No force exceeds your strength, if you are wielding the sword in defense of the sacred heritage that God has made.

When your nations with love's rite return to kneeling before the sacred altar of Rome — the center of human and divine civilization — then they will derive, like Pegasus, an ever new inextinguishable victorious energy.

In vain does Bolshevism, the unclean profaner of every ideal, the denier of all spiritual power, the enemy of God and humanity rise against you, O Europe, in order to bend you to their satrapic and obscene blasphemous will, drunk with orgies and vodka.

In vain does the crippled despot in the White House, victim of Judaic trafficking, look on, livid with anger and corruption; on the ocean, as female prostitutes look at sailors in back alleys; your clear eye, O Europe, remains fixed only on the pure human soul, yearning to climb to the highest peaks of the civilization of Rome.

Stupid and criminal is the vendetta organized by the infernal groans in London and Washington, and by Farinata degli Uberti of the Ghetto, disobedient to the will of God, careless tools of the devil.

Ingenuously cloaked in the mask of international Jewry.

God has enlightened the people: Europe is the visionary.

She has seen the way of her salvation, triumph will save.

The nations of Europe are bound together in a single Fascio against the enemies of Europe and its civilization.

And behold, behind Italy, the theory of peoples thirsting for truth, peace, justice, fruitful love and fruitful works, eagerly rushing to quench their thirst at the source of civilization: in Rome.

There is no Christian heart or soul which does not sense the human and Christian beauty of the sacrifice demanded of their peoples by the Great Leaders of Italy and Germany, for the struggle against Bolshevism, the subverter of every moral, social and family principle; against Bolshevism, the profaner and destroyer of Churches and sacred icons; against Bolshevism, the cynical and barbaric murderer and torturer of Priests and Nuns.

If you love Christ, if you love the Fatherland, if you love family, if you love yourself and the values of the soul, how can you not enlist — in the name of honour and sacred duty — to fight in the ranks of the Axis?

It is the crusade of the civilization of Rome against the barbarism of demo-plutocracy and Bolshevism.

It is the crusade of love against the hatred sown among the peoples of liberalism and communism.

It is the crusade of the highest social justice proclaimed by Fascism, against the iniquities of class struggle preached by democracy and socialism.

It is the crusade of the servants of God against the servants of the devil.

The time has come, and we must fight and we must win.

We are all one mind gathered around the Duce because we believe, firmly believe, in the Christian and Fascist idea of a higher social justice, written on the black Pennants of the Revolution; we are gathered around the Duce to obey Him, who can not fail, enlightened as He is, by clear signs from Providence; we are gathered around the Duce to fight, how and where He commands, until we reach the most decisive and luminous victory which ever smiled upon a people.

Victory is always on the side of those who fight in the name of God.

Italy is with God.

The Jewish Problem in Italy

Published in Gerarchia, June 1942

Roberto Pavese

As we begin to notice a more lively interest on the part of the Regime for the racial problem in general and for the Jewish problem in particular, we notice also a certain nonchalance on the part of certain supposedly "well-intentioned" people who claim that the Jewish problem in Italy is negligible or irrelevant. Therefore it is necessary to address and refute this propaganda once and for all.

The main argument in support of the aforementioned simplistic thesis is purely quantitative. They say: compared to other Nations, such as Germany, Hungary, Poland and Romania, for whom the Jewish question had more considerable importance, and rightly so due to the high percentage of Jews in their respective populations, the number of Jews in Italy is so small that it does not merit any concern, especially if we consider our powerful assimilation capabilities in the face of other races.

However, this argument does not hold water, for various reasons:

1. because upon closer inspection the officially recognized figure of about 52,000 Jews residing in Italy (a figure, indeed, relatively small compared to the 694,000 in Germany, 280,000 in France, 3,300,000 in Poland and 985,000 in Romania, according to the data reported by the journal *Deutsche Volkswirtschaft*) is to be considered considerably lower than the reality, given the fact that many Jews hide their racial origin.

In fact, the aforementioned figure comes from the 1932 census, which also provided the basis for the statistical data presented in a press release published last October, according to which (taking into account the 7,300 or so Jews who left Italy before October 1, 1941) some 43,000 Jews would still remain in the Kingdom of Italy, of which about 35,000 have foreign citizenship. But from 1932 to today the number of Jews in Italy has increased significantly and the census of August 22, 1938 gives a total figure of about 70,000 Jews.

However, to this above-mentioned figure we must add also those Jews who were Aryanized after the promulgation of the racial laws and the discriminated Jews, who are not included in the data of the aforementioned press release.

We must also take into consideration that, precisely because of the strong assimilation capability of our race, the physical characteristics of the Jews living in Italy are much less evident than elsewhere, so that many of them have no difficulty passing as Aryans after conveniently changing their names.

2. Again, due to the minor physical difference of our Jews, there was no way of manifesting between us that sense of repulsion that usually occurs between individuals of distinctly different races.

As a result, unions and mixed marriages have been considerably more frequent in Italy than elsewhere, giving rise to a significant number of legitimate and illegitimate half-breeds, most of whom — as fruitful experience teaches us — remain biologically and above all morally linked to their Jewish side.

We are therefore not far from the truth when we suppose that, between Jews and Half Jews, the aforementioned figure of 50,000 people should at least be tripled.

3. But it does not end there: it is certainly not the quantitative element that makes the Jewish problem particularly serious in Italy. What seriously aggravates things is the qualitative factor. Every Italian Jew, in light of his rank, his culture, his racial activity, his lack of scruples, and the absolute freedom of action that he has enjoyed and in part continues to enjoy despite the recent racial laws, it is not an exaggeration to state that the effects of the material and moral damage they have caused to the political-social structure of the Nation is equivalent to ten of those minor Jewish peddlers who are swarming among the Jewish masses of those Nations with a higher percentage of Semites.

It will not be without interest to note in this regard that the bulk of Jewish immigration to the Italian Peninsula is made up of Spanish Jews of the "Sephardic" group ('Sephard' means Spain) who are notoriously the most virulent and extremist advocates of Zionism.

In Italy, unlike other European nations — except perhaps France, which is on the other side of the barricade — it is therefore the qualitative element that we need to take into maximum consideration in our evaluation of the Jewish problem. The Jewish population of Germany, Hungary, Poland and Romania has a very high percentage of individuals dedicated to the petty filthy business of being peddlers, second-hand dealers and usurers. The parasitism and vampirism of these people does not go beyond the strictly economic sphere, and indeed only affects the lower and superficial aspects of society.

Among our Jewish population, however, this type of Jew dedicated to petty business is far from representing the overwhelming majority, unlike in the aforementioned Nations. Instead, we have a very high percentage of Jewish professionals: officials, industrialists, professors, bankers: in other words, elements that are capable of taking over the command center of the Nation, capable of disseminating their poisonous,

disintegrating and subversive action into the vital organs of the State. The action of these Jews, compared to that of the Jewish population of the ghettos, is comparable to the superficial action exerted on the human body by parasites, as opposed to the deep internal action of the tapeworm.

During the seventy years since the unification of the Kingdom of Italy, in an atmosphere of candid, blissful trust on the part of our educated classes — newly aspiring to bourgeois splendor — as well as our government authorities, our Jews have had the time and opportunity to occupy (or get their Masonic servants to occupy) all the organs of national life, more or less completely ascending to power.

Are you scandalized by this high-level infiltration? Tsk tsk! Was it not perfectly fair that individuals smarter than us would hold the command posts? [Sarcasm] You see, it was merely a just reward for having taught our bourgeois how to be smart, how to "live" and how to do their business on the margins of the law, and if necessary in defiance of the law. This is practically an art form they learned at school. Thus, that external freedom with which the right hand bears arms and signs treaties, which was finally obtained by Italy, was taken away by the left hand of Jewry, i.e. Judeo-Masonic insidiousness. The farce of sovereignty cloaked the tragedy of a renewed slavery to the occult powers of the Pluto-Masonic International, from whom we were only able to liberate ourselves with the Ethiopian War, at least in theory.

At the time when I attended the Polytechnic University of Milan, seven out of ten of the tenured professors were Jews. And this was not a rare case, because the Universities were completely dominated by Jewry. Besides the political and religious agnosticism of the Italian teachers, there was also a large percentage of Jewish teachers whose main objective was to sabotage our religious, historical and cultural traditions, acting with the most subtle and diabolical cunning against Romanity, to the point of erasing its very memory from the consciences of the

youth. The university degree was essentially a diploma of atheism; even if not explicitly taught, in the schools we learned skepticism, pessimism and unethical social climbing. Our bourgeoisie, educated and raised in this soft university climate and materialistic culture, represents the masterpiece of Jewish planning: it is the most interesting example of how a youthful people can be made old, emptied of any noble thought and all masculinity, and turned into a herd of individuals willing to throw away their ancestral rights, race, history and civilization just for a little bit of wealth.

Other Nations have found their salvation by opening their eyes to the Jewish peril. To cite one example, the racial laws in Romania — which in fact are much harsher than ours — were enacted much earlier than those promulgated by us in 1938. For over forty years in Romania the Jew has had no right of citizenship, has had no right to own property, no right to exercise the so-called liberal professions, such as lawyer, engineer, professor; the Jew does not even have the freedom to live where he wants, since he can only live in those municipalities classified as "commercial" and not in the rural ones. Although the weight of these laws for the Jews who had fought in the ranks of the Romanian army was somewhat lightened after the Great War, the laws themselves were later restored and re-established after General Antonescu came to power. It is only by the restoration of these laws that Romania has been able to find salvation after the painful trials of the last decade, which more than once had led it to the brink of collapse.

Not so in France: today they know perfectly well who is responsible for their ruin. They recently published [a document containing] the percentage figures of Jews who occupied positions of authority and command in France immediately before the present war, especially among the members of the Government and Parliament. These figures give us an idea of how a supposedly "free and sovereign" Nation can be completely subservient to a clique of shysters, charlatans and foreigners.

If today it is universally admitted, at least in Europe, that the presence of the Jewish element brings not only the impoverishment of the people but also the corruption of customs, the destruction of all commercial and professional morals, the annulment of all spiritual values, without which it is impossible to transcend one's own person, for society and the Nation, one can well understand what disastrous effects being directly educated in the teachings of Jewry can have on the formation of consciences of young Italians.

And why did Jewry threaten to unleash such an insidious attack of the most ferocious Semitic imperialism against us, at a time when Italy — as a newly-unified country — was still not yet entirely out of its centuries-old slumber? We should see it as a sign of Jewish awareness that Rome was considered by them to be the greatest threat to the hegemonic goals of their race. And they know that we have the cold determination to eliminate this danger once and for all.

Let us not forget that the first attempt at bolshevization was carried out in Italy and that without the Duce, who knows how it would have ended. But Italians have very bad memories: they do not even remember that the Communist threat which we witnessed in the first three years of the post-war period was merely the final act of a drama that began in the last century, and that before the Great War other similar attacks against national well-being were carried out in Italy, such as the 1898 revolts in Milan and the failed attempt to create an "Ambrosian republic" as they have more recently done in Catalonia, Spain; this demonstrates the exquisitely political (rather than social) intentions of the movement. And the Italians have also forgotten that the first act of war made by the Duce was in fact against the Jews, the creators of Freemasonry, and that the Jews themselves — after three decades of anti-Fascist guerrilla warfare — officially declared war against us three years ago through the mouths of their Anglo-Saxon cronies.

This is the war of the Jews: they would not be the only losers, but they would certainly be the only winners; this is the war of gold against the sweat and blood of the proletarian peoples; it is the war that — [if we lose] — will give the Synagogue world domination through the bolshevization of Europe. This is why we must recognize the existence of a Jewish problem unique to Italy, without any sentimental or mental reservation, and must get to the bottom of it with intelligence, tenacity and resoluteness.

Anti-Semitism

Published in the Enciclopedia De Carlo, 1942

Salvatore de Carlo

The term anti-Semitism is a modern coinage and is indicative of a certain political-social movement born within the Indo-European race, a movement that places the Aryans against the Semites for reasons that are independent of theological-religious considerations and which have their origin in the daily relationship of coexistence.

Ever since the beginning of their dispersal in the world (the diaspora), when their nation was destroyed and they accepted the tragic fate that it was no longer possible for them to rebuild their temple and their kingdom, the Jews have lived — and still live — among people of other races, while preserving throughout the ages a constant and strong aspiration to return to their land, a primordial and imperforate racial pride, and a deeply-rooted conviction that they belong to a universal mission commuted to them by God as a chosen people.

The Jews, endowed with uncommon intelligence, and possessing certain qualities and faculties peculiar to their race from the earliest times, rarely assumed the character of the different peoples who hosted them, with whom they never truly assimilated, despite adopting the civic uses, environmental habits and language of their hosts. That is why the Jews never participated, except for sporadic and personal cases, in the national movements of the peoples who hosted them, or only took part when the interests of their community could somehow benefit.

Moreover, due to the solidarity and unaltered consciousness of their own race, in addition to their exceptional qualities of savviness, parsimony and foresight, they became the dominators of global finance; they acquired over time a formidable power which they have always used to obtain their secular aspirations, to the detriment of the other ethnic groups with whom they live.

Thus this explains, in the logical order of human events, the aversion many people have towards the Semitic race, an aversion which was already apparent from the beginning of the Greco-Roman world, when the Jews were reproached for their isolation, their exasperated and exhilarating orthodoxy, and their impiety (atheotès). And troubles erupted against them ever since that time: a copious anti-Judaic literature emerged describing the insidious Jewish spirit and pointing out the danger they posed to the nations that gave them asylum.

During the first two centuries of Christianity, powerful voices appeared against Jewry from the mouth of St. Paul, who rejected the Mosaic Law, Tertullian, St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, all of whom were authors of invectives against Jewry. In the Middle Ages, persecutions against the nomadic people of Israel continued, and they were repeatedly expelled, recalled, driven back again by the various states, entirely or partially excluded from common rights, accused of impiety and held up to public contempt.

This state of affairs lasted for many centuries until the end of the 18th century, when the movement that culminated with the French Revolution and the Declaration of Human Rights began, which represented the salvation and emancipation of the Jews—something they had long yearned for. This was short-lived, however, as in the early 19th century, during the years of European coalitions against Napoleon and the immediate successive ones, the polemics and struggle against the Jews was revived, especially by German writers and thinkers.

During the time of the German national resurgence and the formation of the German Empire, the Jews were more than ever regarded as a force contrary to the achievement of national goals. Later in Russia too there was a certain resistance against the Jews with the emergence of the Pan-Slav movement. Then the conflict grew more and more widespread, and caught the interest of other nations in the exact moments when they were undertaking movements of resurgence, independence and freedom.

Meanwhile, the Jews continued the subtle and methodical of infiltrating all the social movements of the various countries in order to sabotage their national goals and move them towards internationalism, which best served the sad condition of the landless Jews. Even in Italy the Jews were often times frequent obstacles to the attainment of certain goals necessary for the fulfillment of national aspirations, but here the struggle against the Jews never took on the character of violence, thanks to the particular ability of the Italic people to civilize others, and thanks to the power of immunity of Roman law.

But when a series of widespread social-political manifestations occurred, which started with the Treaty of Versailles and culminated with the establishment of the League of Nations, followed by the Great War of 1914-1918, down to the cry of the Germanic nation — which first suffered the damage of a hybrid Jewish-plutocratic coalition that stifled the rights, justice, freedom and the natural aspirations of the young and healthy people — Italy also rose up against the Jews with wise measures that severed their harmful activities.

In Germany, the struggle became definitive because the government was forced to take radical action against the Jewish element that infected all the vital branches of the nation.

A typical example of the gravity of Jewish infiltration in Central and Eastern Europe is given by the recent events in Poland; it is sufficient to remember that in Warsaw alone the Jews have reached the large sum of 500,000 individuals. The

disadvantages caused by this huge mass of individuals, among whom hygiene was nonexistent with all due respect, were so many and such that Germany had to intervene with severely restrictive measures.

In fact, after the occupation of Poland, the civil government of the new German Governorate faced the grave problem of this kind of hydra that paralyzed all healthy activities and, among other things, established ghettos where the Jewish population was confined. These ghettos are separated from the rest of the community by a walled enclosure, and the Jews can only leave if they have a special permit. Once a week they must sprinkle the threshold of their homes with lime and chlorine; they are not allowed, for hygienic reasons, to board the trams except on the trailer; carriages reserved for Jews are marked with a special sign. In addition, all the inhabitants of the ghetto must wear a band with the star of David as a sign of recognition.

The great world conflict, unleashed in 1939 between the powers of the Axis (Italy and Germany) and the so-called democratic powers (France and England), and later extended to other peoples and other nations to affect all the continents of Earth, has made clear the deceptive work done for centuries by the scattered children of Israel within the nations that generously gave them hospitality; a work of corruption and destruction aimed at upsetting any system of civilization no matter where; a work intended to stifle any principle of morality and religion, to neutralize any attempt at spiritual elevation, to push the shady traffic of gold and blood. For nearly two millennia they have attempted to consume the whole of humanity.

For this reason, their renewed persecution — which responds to a clear and obvious curse that has accompanied them for centuries — is more than justified and seems to have certain signs that it is now final and decisive.

Secret Societies

Published in Gerarchia, 1924

Fermi

The law against secret societies unanimously approved by the Chamber of Deputies on May 20th has an importance that transcends politics. That is why I must write this brief article for you.

I have before me the large and vivid report of the Commission for the Study of Law Reform, which is entitled: The State and Secret Societies. Those who have studied the subject find it quite objective, in spite of its polemical tone and its undisguised intent. I am basing my article on that source.

Freemasonry was born in England in 1717 and rapidly spread to Central Europe. Soon it penetrated among us, and it was always willing to welcome foreign currents. It was invaluable in the hands of both French and Austrian rulers throughout that century, and its importance was also felt in England, which was seeking large naval bases in the Mediterranean. Napoleon despised it, but used it mercilessly. After 1815 the restless Masons placed themselves in the service of the new ruling masters, including Austria.

Freemasonry certainly had nothing to do with the Risorgimento. The Masons generally did not play any role in the political processes that took place between 1821 and 1858. Freemasonry was cosmopolitan and humanitarian; it was pacifist... devoted to a bland tactic of infiltration and penetration; it was anti-religious and specifically anti-Catholic (indeed it had its origins in Anglican Deism, French Encyclopedism and Lutheran Illuminism). The Risorgimento, on the other hand, was a national event, with abstract humanitarian

tendencies; it was combative and warlike, celebrating sacrifice and its regenerative virtue for the weakened Italians; it was a religious movement and almost always Catholic; indeed, it regarded Catholicism as a means of spiritual unity which preserved the moral personality of the Italian people. It was also explicitly opposed to Masonic sects and fought against their methods, rejecting their usefulness on the one hand, and the other hand condemning the profound failure that they generated. Ugo Foscolo had already clearly said that in order to unite Italy, these sects had to be destroyed:

"These Secret Societies form many States with the State; they are a source of corruption and substantial despotism, hiding behind the mask of liberty."

Shortly before 1860, Freemasonry strenuously reorganized itself and arose against the Pope, but not against the Pope-King. The Vatican's political resistance to the Risorgimento gave rise to an anti-clericalism that was celebrated by the Lodges, who benefited from its emergence. They were not immune from "inspiration by foreign powers" (U. Bacci). At that time there were discords and quarrels between brothers over questions of rites, pre-eminences, and due to personal and regional rivalries. There were invectives, bands and excommunications... But then, around 1880, a certain peace was achieved and the most flattering invitations were addressed to the intellectual bourgeoisie: professors, magistrates, lawyers, even businessmen:

"We must keep in mind that that phase of Italian life—with its crowd of new people from the countryside intent on finding its way, with its philosophical positivism and its rather simplistic mentality, with its new gods (Justice, Liberty, Equality, Reason), depleted of content and subjected to idols or fetishes—was excellent hunting ground for Freemasonry."

It found numerous proselytes among the disappointed, the restless, the dreamers, the radicals, the republicans:

"This widespread anti-clerical spirit, in the most negative sense of the word, which reflected the absence of philosophy and the absence or decline of other more substantial and positive ideals, also benefited Freemasonry, which stimulated it and exasperated its old anti-clericalism, and made it its *raison d'être*."

A reconciliation between the State and the Holy See was feared by them and regarded by them as a supreme evil. This same opposition was also shared by certain foreign powers, who rightly believed that a reconciliation with the Vatican would cause Italy to be strengthened.

The Army and the Navy, which for a hundred reasons must fiercely preserve their independence, as a condition of absolute loyalty to the Nation, unfortunately allowed themselves to be ensnared, so that at the end of the century the Masonic sect had risen to boundless and uncontrollable power. By now it dominated "all the organs and nerve centers of Italian society". It was able to impose its will on weak, crafty or irresponsible rulers. The big banks, the gods of contemporary Mammonism, became one of the greatest instruments of Freemasonry's mighty power. Around 1900 a reaction broke out against it by the Socialists, who:

"...had fought against Freemasonry's humanitarianism, windbag democracy, drowsiness, bourgeois attitude and Francophilia. But then, as the majority of Socialists opened up to Masonic influences and allowed themselves to be taken over, there was a reaction [against Masonry] by small groups of socialist realizers, revolutionary socialists and syndicalists, educators, idealist philosophers, young liberals, Christian democrats, innovative and futuristic patrols, and nationalists... A movement emerged against Freemasonry from a philosophical, cultural, political and moral point of view. It was seen as a remnant of 18th century illusionism, a source of bad mental habits, of confusion in political ideas and parties, of degeneracy

in public life; it was seen as the embodiment of intrigue, illicit cronyism and likened to the Mafia. On the eve of the war, the campaign against Freemasonry was vehement. At that time a referendum was held: over one hundred writers, publicists and politicians responded, including Croce, Amendola, Einaudi, Mosca, Sergi, Bonomi, Giacosa, Bonfante, Solmi, D'Ovidio."

In general, there was open condemnation of every secret society. There was a particular dislike for Freemasonry in the army, in the magistrate, in the schools. It was agreed that this was an old thorn stuck in the side of many delicate organs of society; it was agreed that Freemasonry actively worked against our great need for absolute discipline, undermined our sense of responsibility, and perturbed the public spirit.

The European war put a halt to this campaign:

"Freemasonry supported intervention, indeed it led it. No one asked the Masons the real reason why—and for whom—they supported intervention in the war, even if everyone noticed their vehement expressions of support for freedom and justice, and even if everyone knew they did not have our own country's interests in mind... But during and after the war there was no lack of eloquent essays on the intrinsic nature of Masonic interventionism... It is bad that Freemasonry is an organization of crony nepotism, but even worse is the fact that it is oriented towards a certain determined political agenda and seeks to achieve its ends through occult methods."

According to the report, the State has the right and duty to fight Freemasonry for the following reasons:

1. In Freemasonry there is a foreign and intrinsically anti-national mentality, one which is individualistic, democratic and anti-historical in the mechanical and

atomistic sense of the word, which hinders the formation of a steady and coherent national consciousness which is still the privilege or desire of a minority.

2. Since Freemasonry is and claims to be universal and therefore international, the danger inherent in the mental subjection of Italian Freemasonry to theories fashioned by foreigners is aggravated, so that it easily opens the gates for interference by foreign governments and foreign parties in our national politics.
3. Freemasonry, by obliging its adherents to silence, even at the cost of lying, helps to distort and corrupt the character of Italians. The political struggle in Italy can not take place with full sincerity and genuineness of attitudes and relationships, because it is possible for the Masonic sect to creep into every party, disguising itself, in order to promote a program of interests for unknown or unspeakable reasons, to deviate from its spirit, to control or take over its deliberations, to betray them, and finally to betray everyone; in short, each party suffers from fear and suspicion—often times with good reason—that there are secret enemies within their ranks.
4. Freemasonry perpetuates and exacerbates outdated anti-clericalism, which is harmful because it hinders the peaceful resolution of the disagreement between Italy and the Papacy, and nourishes or justifies the resistance of intransigent Catholics and the apprehensions of Catholic patriots.
5. The truest essence of Freemasonry, which had attracted legions of adherents, was to constitute a Mafia-like organization to defend purely private interests. Its activities have polluted all the central and local branches of State and municipal administration. It inserts itself into the most delicate organs of national life and leverages the banks, which are largely subservient to

Masonic interests; its principal weapon is secrecy, which degrades consciences, distorts them to a practically unbreakable silence, obliges them to an internal solidarity that annuls and surpasses all other duties of loyalty and justice, and which protects those who benefit from impunity.

For these reasons, the Commission believes that in order to rehabilitate the organs of national life, it is necessary first of all to undertake a fight against Freemasonry. This in itself gives the State the right to destroy it. Since its power lies in secrecy, the State has the right and the duty to prohibit it from being secretive. Being enrolled in Freemasonry therefore may not be held as a crime in and of itself, however the act of trying to hide it can be.

It is not for me to tackle—let alone solve—the question of whether the State can take up the Commission's proposals and legislate accordingly. I am neither a politician nor a professor of law. I only say that if Freemasonry is really a danger and a threat to the autonomy of State organs, to the sovereignty of law, and to the good rights of citizens, and if, on the other hand, the iron rule of the Romans still applies: *Salus reipublicae suprema lex esto* ("The safeguard of the republic shall be the supreme law"), then any man with common sense will not hesitate for one moment to abandon Freemasonry.

The moral and religious conscience also allows us to take into consideration and judge other aspects of the issue. Masonic secrecy not only permits but imposes lying, i.e., the opposite of the general and constant ethical and religious norms, without which the mutual trust between peoples is destroyed and the respect of each person for himself and for others is destroyed.

Moreover, the Masonic bond imposes blind obedience to occult Powers, which by no means justify the authority that they presume to entrust to their command. What do these invisible and uncontrollable masters want and what are their aims? It is an

absolute mystery. But at least what are the ideals and interests on whose behalf they are mediating and demanding obedience? Are they those of the Family, of the Fatherland, of Humanity, of Conscience, of God? Men who rise above animal instincts and selfishness seek to work in the name of one or more of those principles; sublime men, in the greatest hours, work in the name of all of them, harmonized in one.

It seems clear to me that Freemasonry has nothing to do with the family, nor the Fatherland (see above), since much their supreme directives come from foreign leaders.

What does God have to do with it? For at least a century, Latin Masonry has been openly atheist. You can not serve humanity by denying God.

Conscience? No; blind submission to masters who do not know each other and who do not know what they want, nor what principles or interests they are representing, is profoundly immoral. They do not deserve to be called men, but sheep.

Liberty?... This beautiful liberty which takes away all rights.

Justice? They form a crony nepotistic society to buy up the best posts for themselves, keeping them away from more worthy candidates...

In short, they regard themselves as the chosen, the light of the world, the salt of the earth; they think they are the necessary aristocracy.

In all ages intelligent and aggressive minorities have led the multitudes, either to salvation or to perdition. Gaetano Mosca has shown with great keenness that even under a democratic regime the minorities reign, indeed they are more imperative than ever, precisely because they conceal their own desires under the banner of majority rights. Thus it happens that sincere (perhaps brutal) regimes are dominated by Aristocracies, while lying regimes are dominated by demagogic oligarchies. Which of

these does Freemasonry represent? ... I say: a worthy Aristocracy is chosen—not self-appointed—from men superior in intellect, experience, capacity, self-denial, selflessness. Men who seek nothing for themselves, but offer what they have; men whose thoughts, activities and passions are for those whom they have in their custody; men who, as Plato says, give their own blood if necessary.

It is far easier to obtain a verdict from religious conscience, especially in regards to French Rite Freemasonry. Everyone knows that the "Great Architect of the Universe" is neither God nor the devil. Someone made reference to the 33rd degree diploma that the Grand Orient of Paris conferred upon the heroic but very naive Garibaldi. That lodge despises and hates everything that is most dear to the religious conscience of Christians. And it is really pointless to deny it.

Scottish Rite Freemasonry famously controls and promotes Anglo-Saxon political-religious interests. Therefore Italian Catholics must be on guard. The Masonic spirit is more widespread and rooted than one might imagine, especially in certain centers which the native temperament and fierce propaganda of sister nations have exposed to greater infection. A humorist has defined one of the big cities in northern Italy as a *ville toupinière* ("molehill city").

We must fight our opponents as if they were impostors and rebels. No sacrifice is excessive when the prestige of one's own flag is at stake. ... Lies, perfidy, slander, or at least insinuations that operate as subtle-poison, are the usual weapons of these sectarians, whatever label they go by.

Masonic fury permeates the high schools sacred to science, piety and love. There are those who fight against Freemasonry by employing means and methods and obeying sentiments that are the very quintessence of Freemasonry. Would it be worthwhile to have destroyed Freemasonry, only for other sects bearing another

name, but marked by the same spirit of oppression and insincerity, to take its place?

Our warning to the youth will not be in vain, because they—still pure, still free—will not give up their freedom and their dignity.

Ethnic Minorities

Published in Gerarchia, 1927

Giuseppe Cristofolini

Italy, in conquering its natural borders along the Alpine ridge, has found included within its borders about 180,000 alloglots, some of them of German origin (residues of medieval barbarian invaders), others Italians who were Germanized in the course of the centuries.

Indeed, in Venezia Tridentina there is no compactly German northern territory, as is claimed by the Pan-Germanists who do not know how to cope with the loss of the beautiful "South Tyrol", but rather there is an area of mixed population with a preponderance of the German element in some towns.

The first Teutonic penetrations into the upper valleys of the Adige date to the second half of the 6th century. The barbaric Baiuvari tribe, coming across the Brenner from Bavaria, passes into the Isarco basin and into Pusteria, taking up a permanent settlement there and overwhelming the scarce native population, which in part remains there, losing traces of its Latin origin after several centuries, while another part withdraws into the most distant valleys between the mountains, where it is able to keep its ancient character and ancient language intact.

Thus, after the 7th and 8th centuries, the Ladin lands of Badia, Marebbe and Gardena are distinguished from the Isarco and Pusteria valleys, which from then on — in terms of customs and language — have a Germanized population, united ecclesiastically to the German archbishopric of Salzburg after 798.

The Germanization occurs at a much slower pace in the territory of the upper Adige valley, due to the strong resistance during the Longobard and Frankish periods on the part of the Duchy and March of Trento, which also includes the area of Bolzano and marks the boundaries of Italy at the lock of Bressanone.

German immigrants live here for a long time alongside the natives, without being able to impose their own language on them. The towns of Caldaro and Appiano, and especially Bolzano, maintain their Romance language throughout the Middle Ages.

In Venosta, German dominance is greatly favored by the ecclesiastical power, the influence of which makes itself felt when — after the Treaty of Verdun — the bishopric of Chur, which has jurisdiction over the valley, passes from dependency on the archbishopric of Milan to that of Mainz, and even later around the year 1150, when the German Benedictine abbey of Marienberg is founded, which is the only influential center of culture in those remote villages.

During this time the methodical and aggressive denationalization policy of the counts of Tyrol (who usurp the lands of the Adige from the princes of Trento) and their successors the Dukes of Austria manifests itself and develops: a policy which achieves remarkable and indisputable results; while on the other hand the contiguous Val Monastero, united to Switzerland, preserves and still today maintains the language of Rome.

The definitive prevailing of German over Romance in Venosta dates back to the Counter-Reformation period, in relation to the persecutions against the Ladins of Protestant Grisons. However, numerous testimonies attest to the continued persistence of Latinity, as evidenced by the fact that the German curia still has to turn to the Romansh friars of the Grisons for sermons and confessions in the 1600's.

In the 17th and 18th centuries the Ladin language disappears in the area north of Merano, especially after the introduction of German schools, although it left numerous genuine expressions in the dialect of today's German-speakers and clearly reveals itself in the local toponymy.

The conditions are quite different in the Val d'Adige south of Merano, where Germanism makes its greatest progress towards the end of the Middle Ages, descending along the river towards Trento. The wide furrow, which marks the most direct and most traveled road between Italy and Germany, sees the two peoples meet and mingle in alternating events.

With the expansion of the power of the counts of Tyrol, the Germans advance towards the flourishing cities of the Adige and towards the villages south of Bolzano. Foreign nobles are invested with new jurisdictions, where they settle and bring with them a certain number of vassals from their native lands. An overwhelming number of convents arise particularly around the most populated centers — mighty fortresses of Germanism all connected to the religious orders beyond the Brenner.

The Italian element, however, does not yield, being reinforced by the increasingly frequent relations with Venetian and Lombard merchants, especially in Bolzano which adopts Italian as a commercial language and whose city life comes under the influence of the princely court of Trento, dazzling with splendors of the Italian Renaissance.

The temporary union of the Prince-Bishopric of Bressanone with that of Trento brings closer together the fortunes of Alto Adige to those of Trentino, and the regional geographical unity is increasingly felt due to the natural identity of interests, production and climate.

The years pass, the Napoleonic wars come, which ushers in the rights of the nation, bringing the borders of the Italic Kingdom to the north of Bolzano and Merano.

But the time is not yet ripe. The Empire of Vienna returns with a reactionary policy. The Principality of Trento is suppressed and Austria assumes direct and absolute dominion over Venezia Tridentina for the first time.

However, in the last century, Italian immigration progresses from the Trentine valleys of Non and Fiemme and from the Val Lagarina, into both the cities and the countryside, where our farmers begin the reclamation of marshy lands — an unconscious pioneer of national recovery.

Therefore, the last period before the war marks an increase in the Italianness of Alto Adige, not organized but spontaneous and progressive. But it also marks — following the separation of Lombardy and Venetia — a de-nationalization of which the Austrian imperial government, the Tyrolean provincial government, the secular and religious clergy and the Pan-Germanist associations are all powerful instruments.

German schools and German priests impose themselves in all the villages up to Salorno, including the Italian centers of Vadena, Bronzollo, Laives, etc., and after the 1870's also in the Ladin valleys of Gardena and Badia. Italian place names and family names are bastardized with German endings or even translated into German.

Each new building flaunts the exotic features of northern architecture never before seen in this region. Especially in Bolzano, new districts are built with a deliberately Teutonic appearance, in contrast to the old Venetian-style city, and a monument to Walter — a German minstrel — is erected in the main square as a symbol of Germanism.

Our population lives in a state of absolute inferiority in the face of overbearing German-speakers favored by the government. The Italian workforce and Italian capital are banned, while all the facilities are given to German companies; and craftsmen, professionals, teachers, priests and officials from beyond the Alps

are called into the country, as was also demonstrated in some definitive pages of the book published in 1911 by Benito Mussolini: "Il Trentino visto da un socialista".

No Italian writing is seen anymore, nor bilingual writings, but only the language of the rulers dominates.

In the face of such a threat, our nation is absent; the people of Trentino give little help, being as they are too busy trying to fend off the snares that are pressing them on nearly all sides.

Ettore Tolomei and Ferruccio Tolomei rise up almost alone to fight the beautiful battle for Italy at the Brenner with great tenacity; equally great is the indifference of their compatriots.

Thus the war finds the nation unprepared for the problem of foreigners within the state border. Victory brings us the territory, but could not save the citizens, as any conscience of Italianness was suffocated by Teutonic arrogance over the centuries, in order to guarantee that the gate to the Italian Peninsula would remain open and free for their invasions.

For four years after the war, all the instruments ordered by Austria for the definitive interlocking of the towns north of Salorno were left to subsist and operate. It is necessary that a new national consciousness be formed: the advent of Fascist Italy is necessary.

The March on Rome has its prelude in the March on Bolzano and Trento, during which Perathoner and Credaro — the German enemy and the cowardly Italian — are expelled from their posts.

Italy finally makes itself felt at the Brenner. Our sovereign language enters schools, state and municipal offices, Italian toponymy returns, anti-national associations are dissolved and ties with foreign countries are severed; provisions are applied to nationalize the new citizens.

The Italian element finally prevails; the alloglot, by nature meek and industrious, shows himself obedient to the established authorities.

Our language, thanks to a wise education policy, is understood and spoken almost everywhere.

The increasingly frequent contacts with the interior, especially with Trentino, bring the new compatriots closer to us. The Ladin lands and villages under Bolzano have returned to their Italic purity, despite the fact that here and there German doctors, officials and especially priests are still operating and some squires still exercise feudal rights there, according to the customs of the past.

National consciousness is rising in the numerous self-styled Germans — Italians by blood and by name — who populate Bolzano and the surrounding villages, and the old pro-Austrian personalities, who were previously recognized by our authorities and considered representatives of the country, have now been justly cast aside.

Pan-Germanism, however, has not disarmed itself: it fears our strength, but also takes advantage of our deficiencies.

A strong slanderous propaganda campaign has been launched against Italy abroad and money is collected to finance the reaction against our policy.

There is a veiled resistance led by a few stubborn individuals, in frequent connection with the German irredentist circles of Innsbruck and Munich, aided in their action by recently immigrated foreigners who — in absolutely excessive numbers — work and own homes and property in Alto Adige, although, due to the excessive tolerance of past governments, they have become Italian citizens.

Above all, the rabble-rousing work of the clergy, which still exerts a pernicious political influence on the populations through

the church, the school and charitable institutions, proves to be fearful.

Anti-national associations and institutes are trying to resist, and the work of the Austrian banks continues: despite our prohibitions, they still keep their branches in Bolzano, Merano and Bressanone open.

Of course there is still a lot to do, also because from time to time our action has been subjected to uncertainties and interruptions.

Suffice it to mention the land redemption, which particular provisions should have favored, but which so far has not been carried out.

The result of a centuries-old denationalization policy can not disappear in only a few years.

But Italy, rejecting past weaknesses, must resume its vigilant post on the now forever forbidden threshold, carrying out that work of assimilation proclaimed by the Duce, which is required for the interest and by the law of the nation.

The Most Common Errors of European Anti-Fascism

Published in Gerarchia, September 1938

Guido Mastracchio

Many individuals in Europe are convinced that Mussolini's corporativism is nothing more than a transitory political movement, destined to end with the disappearance of the mind that directs and sustains it.

Many others firmly believe that it is a simple awakening of the more conservative part of society which aims — in agreement with the Church — to turn back time in order to better combat the Communist danger.

Finally, others see corporativism as an exclusively economic movement; that is to say, a set of rules that serve only to regulate production and relations between producers and the State.

In the interest of European peace, it would be necessary to demonstrate — and if it has been demonstrated, to repeat — that all of these are very big mistakes!

That Mussolinian corporativism is a political movement lasting a few decades is an absurdity that could only be thought up by those who have a totally superficial idea of the Italian revolution. Mussolinian corporativism is by no means an ideological system destined to be supplanted over time by another ideological system, but is a doctrine based on the eternal laws of nature.

In fact, in the article published in the Italian Encyclopedia, Mussolini writes:

"One does not act spiritually as a human will dominating the will of others in the world without a conception of the transient and particular reality under which it is necessary to act, and of the permanent and universal reality in which the first has its being and its life. ... In order to act among men, as in the natural world, it is necessary to enter into the process of reality and to take possession of the already operating forces."

Now what is the permanent and universal reality in which the transient and particular reality lives, if not this: that our present world has gradually developed from a shapeless primitive matter, and that the slow evolution of things and men through the ages has been and always will be governed by laws arranged by God for a purpose which the human mind is not suited to understand?

And what are the forces at work in the process of reality, if not those that have always subjected and still subject the organic world to an evolutionary movement, which goes from the simple to the complex, from the less perfect to the most perfect, from the unconscious to the intelligent?

On the basis of that reality and these forces, Mussolini saw what no statesman had seen before him, namely that the evolution of the organic world — whether one follows the theory of St. Augustine or follows the Darwinian theory — has an evidently ascensional character and consequently: just as it brought men from the cave to the nation conceived as a simple organization, so, slowly but surely, it must lead them to that most perfect form of life which is the nation conceived as a biological organism, endowed with its own conscience, its own will, its own predisposition.

And with the awareness of working for the good of his Fatherland and the world, Mussolini, taking possession of the forces at play, hastened the slow process of nature, transforming the Italian State — which passively and unconsciously suffered

the action of social forces, and lived, with a great waste of energy, a confused and aimless life — into a State conscious of the origin and direction of the forces of nature, and therefore capable of regulating their development as, in small way, the expert farmer does when he wants to transform a forest into a park; or as the traffic policeman does, when he transforms the tumultuous movement of the streets of a metropolis into an ordered movement, useful to everyone.

Mussolinian corporativism is therefore anything but an ideology! Instead, it is a doctrine that has a positive scientific basis. A doctrine that arose from a system of historical forces, has remained inserted in it and operates from within it. It has also become a force: a spiritual force that tends to remake not the forms of human life, but the content, the man, the character, the faith.

Such a doctrine which tends to use and polarize all the energies of a people to a precise and noble purpose, thus giving them the greatest chance of winning the struggle for life, is in complete harmony with the laws of nature and cannot last for decades, but centuries. Contrary to what the politicians of the great democracies think, it must, out of necessity of things, be embraced by all the nations that want to be truly strong; and it will fill with itself a whole new period of civilization absolutely different from those which have occurred up to now in six thousand years of history, since it will no longer be men or groups of men who act, but states and groups of states.

No less serious is the error of those who believe that Fascism is a reactionary movement; a return to the time of the Holy Alliance, with the valuable assistance of the Church.

Mussolini has always been very clear in this regard: "If the bourgeoisie" — he said in the first constituent meeting of the Fascist Combat League — "thinks to find in us a lightning-conductor, it is mistaken. We must go forward to meet labour and we will fight technical and spiritual retrogression."

A few years later, in his article *Posizioni*, published in *Il Popolo d'Italia*, he wrote:

"If there were anyone thinking of contemplating a return to the conditions of half a century ago, we will take a stand, bearing in mind not the more or less conflicting interests of individuals, but the immediate and future interests of the Nation."

And finally in the article written for the Italian Encyclopedia in 1931, he reiterated:

"The Fascist repudiations of socialism, democracy, liberalism, should not, however, be interpreted as implying a desire to drive the world backwards to positions occupied prior to 1789... History does not travel backwards. The Fascist doctrine has not taken De Maistre as its prophet. Monarchical absolutism is of the past, and so is theocracy."

This is therefore enough to reassure the friends of progress, especially since everything that Mussolini said or wrote has not remained a dead letter, but has been practically translated into numerous social laws and colossal works of renewal and reconstruction whose importance may grow over time, but not diminish.

As for the fear that the Church, with its moderating influence, may delay the development of the revolution, or even neutralize its dynamism, we must not exaggerate. It is not the Church that hinders the triumph of good ideas, but rather the infinite number of selfish and self-interested people. Pope Leo XIII, in fact, in 1891 wrote the Encyclical *Rerum novarum*, giving the social question a solution that in many points precedes the corporative one of Mussolini, and more recently modern cultural and social problems have been treated with a truly modern and highly human spirit by many priests.

"More than once" — writes, for example, Fr. Semeria — "we have proven our enemies right who accused Christianity of being outdated. More than once we have jealously locked ourselves in the temple singing sacred hymns, while the people outside died of moral exhaustion. ... But the time has come to disprove yesterday's defects, and show people contemporary men. Dear priests, we know that God did not intend for Christianity to be implemented in just one time and one place only; we know that it is Catholic, precisely because in its fertile womb it possesses principles to enlighten and strength to govern every more complicated form of civilization."

However, at the point we are at today, the problem of harmonizing cultural developments with religion, and of giving the world the solid and secure norms of a higher life, has become so difficult and complicated that the Church can no longer — as in the time of St. Thomas — solve it alone. Today we also need the help of the State. Above all we need the help of a man who has the strength to reconstitute the Empire, and to rebuild it in such a way as to realize not the ideal of Boniface VIII, but that of Dante Alighieri, who — as Giovanni Papini writes — "is more intimately and profoundly alive, from the political point of view, than he has ever been since his own day: more modern than many moderns, more alive than many dead who believe themselves to be living."

Finally, corporativism is by no means a mere economic movement. In this respect, Lloyd George's claim that Fascism is a convenient ideological screen that hides materialistic and aggressive aims is as false as Fovel's assertion that *homo corporativus* is basically a *homo economicus* which operates hedonistically. The Mussolinian doctrine is characterized by the principle that the world does not operate according to the laws of economics, as Karl Marx claimed, but operate according to the highest and most complex laws of biology. And it is precisely by replacing the materialist conception of history with the biological conception that Mussolini was able to solve the most formidable

problem that the human mind can pose: that of finally giving the life of peoples a meaning and a direction that can be recognized as just by everyone. Something which neither the meditations of all philosophers nor the struggles of all statesmen had ever managed to do over the centuries. The truth therefore is that Mussolinian corporativism is neither a simple economic movement nor a simple political movement, but it is a natural totalitarian movement of social classes towards collaboration, towards the most complete solidarity, that is to say, towards a constitution similar to that of the human body, which is the most perfect known to us.

One can discuss the modalities, the order to be given and the step to be taken, but the movement itself — which is inevitable, necessary and inexorable — cannot be discussed. It can be slower or faster according to the nature of the peoples, and it can also have more or less long pauses; but it cannot be stopped. Believing that it can stop is the same as putting oneself, as Mussolini wrote, out of history and life, which is a continuous flow and becoming. In this regard, the French writer M. Zachin, who in his study on Fascism asks, not without a certain irony, whether the left-wing corporativists will be able to practically regulate social life — according to corporative ideals — up to their final and logical consequences, or whether the right-wing corporativists will succeed in reducing Mussolini's doctrine to a mere ideal aspiration, while the world continues to go its way; we will reply that above men and nations there are great truths, and that these truths, once brought to light by genius, are destined to inevitably triumph in the world.

There may well be nations that are retreating — sang Lucretius — but there are others that are marching forward. The world is a continuous story and, like runners, peoples are passed the torch of life and civilization from hand to hand.

Catholics and Racialism

Published in La Rassegna nazionale, January 1939

Giulio de' Rossi dell'Arno

The Duce, regarding Italian racism, pointed out clearly and definitively:

"You know and everyone knows that also on the question of race we will shoot straight. To say that Fascism has imitated anyone or anything is simply absurd."

But international anti-Fascism — that is, a world full of people of every physical colour, politics and morality — today marches against triumphant Fascism, which regenerates the civilization of Rome.

The group which has chosen to fight against us has done so "naturally" due to a misunderstanding.

In fact, it is only by such a misunderstanding that individuals whose aims are antithetical to each other, such as between Christians and Bolsheviks, could possibly fight together under the same banner.

The misunderstanding which has been commonly embraced by the heterogeneous jumble of Liberals, Democrats, Masons, Catholics and Communist parties is this: that Italian racism is identical to German racism.

Every clear and honest spirit sees that the opposite is true. Italian racism and German racism are absolutely different from each other, biologically and historically, being expressed by two different Fatherlands.

If, as it is argued, there is nothing different between German and Italian racism, then the principles of racial theory would appear far-fetched.

So then why quibble against Italian racism, which would come to demonstrate the baselessness of that doctrine, to the greater glory of Jewish-Bolshevik cosmopolitanism?

Now it is true that there exists a German racial reality and an Italian racial reality, identical in their particulars, but in many respects very different due to the characteristics of the two peoples. Nor does the common origin of the Aryan stock — the builder of our civilization and therefore of the unifying energy of Europe — which is eagerly seized upon by the opponents of racism — by any means invalidate this truth, as the anti-Fascists wrongly and in bad faith claim.

In fact, the Aryans who settled in the North found a people, an historic environment and a physical climatic condition which was absolutely different from those Aryans who turned to the South, and found in the sunny Italic peninsula an already flourishing industry of peoples.

The two families became differentiated, therefore, under the influence of the environment, so that we have the Aryan-Roman race here, and the Aryan-Germanic to the north.

Two races which location and history have made distinct from one another, but in the course of the centuries always found themselves fighting for the defense of the common European civilization.

If one denies that from a single strain there could arise assorted races which historical events and diverse natural environments differentiate, causing a different development or improvement of the original somatic and intellectual characteristics, then it is not clear how those Catholics who oppose racism can possibly rush to the defense of the Revealed Truth of the common origin of the human race in Adam.

This is a Revealed Truth which Italian racism does not offend and does not deny.

From a single stock created by God, in fact, by Providential and inscrutable design, derived the people who then became differentiated to such an extent, that the same Catholic missionaries spoke of the danger of miscegenation as an ignitor to the decadence of mankind.

Therefore, while deriving from the same Aryan stock, there is the German race on the one side and the Italian race on the other; thus there are two substantially different forms of racism, which the different characteristics of the two races intend to defend, develop and refine.

But the assault against "Italian racism" is intended above all to strike against the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo alliance; a formidable bulwark against Bolshevism and Jewish cosmopolitanism.

In fact, the democratic foreigners are scrambling to prove that our friendship with the Germans is irrational and incite us to hate them. Just what kind of principles of brotherhood these people are engaged in, many of whom claim to be Christians, we do not know; we only know that they speak for anti-Fascist democratic fanaticism. That is all we need to know.

But to say that racism is synonymous with paganism is a patent falsehood, which must be denied. On the contrary, "Italian racism" constitutes a barrier against atheism and pantheism. Italian racial doctrine, in fact, is inspired by the necessity of the integral defense of the physical, spiritual, moral and traditional values of our race, the creator and bearer of civilization. Since our national tradition is Roman and Catholic, it follows that racism safeguards the imperial and Christian romanity of the Italian people.

Although many have found themselves mentally and culturally unprepared to comprehend the current reasons for racism, this does not detract from its essential value as a defense

of Roman and Catholic human civilization, which today is renewed in the Fascist synthesis.

In a world that was rushing toward Jewish, Masonic and Bolshevik materialist cosmopolitanism, that is to say, the antithesis of the spirit of Christianity, Fascism has elevated her defense of racism and the spirit of the Italian Fatherland.

It is obvious that Fascism could not pretend to save the whole anti-Roman world with the wave of a magic wand; it felt, however, the human and Christian duty to at least save the Italian people from the threat of chaos.

The Fascist Fatherland is therefore locked in her racist fortress, raising the drawbridge to all the errors of cosmopolitanism, so as not to destroy the material and spiritual energies of our Italianity, which is a perennial source of civil progress in the world.

There is no other way we can save ourselves from the infection of materialism which physically and spiritually kills the people.

The perfidious Bolshevik deception did not become victorious with half-measures. We must not leave doors ajar, through which the enemy can stealthily enter, after having already thrown out all the enemies of the Roman and imperial soul of our race, and first of all the Jews, cosmopolitans par excellence. Italian racism — integrally regenerating the physical and spiritual values of the Roman race — strives to bring her back to the pinnacle of her civil primacy.

There does not exist, therefore, and can not exist, in the doctrine and in the practices of Fascism anything that is irreconcilable with the Christian soul of the Italian people. When the acts of Fascism are examined and evaluated in light of this truth, which the historical event of the Conciliation [with the Vatican] confirmed for all honest men, it becomes clear that nothing can disturb in the conscience and in the heart of the

Italian people the harmony between religious sentiment and Fascism.

Inside the War

Published in Civiltà fascista, January 1936

Indro Montanelli

I am not in Asmara. I state this to avoid any misunderstanding: both for personal dignity as a soldier, and to correct—where necessary—my, or our, colossal ignorance of events.

Those of us who are fighting in the war can not offer testimonies about the war in general, because we see only our short and variable sector, which is always of limited importance. We can only offer testimonies about "our" war, how we see it and what we expect. But will not such a testimony somewhat disappoint the metropolitan readers if we say that this war so far has been little more than a simple guerrilla war—not by our choice—and that we ourselves are rather disappointed? The reality down here is such that it has created an authentic psychological imbalance between the Italians of the two continents. Those who write to us should take this into account, but this is perhaps an inhuman expectation.

Let us therefore reduce our wishes to this alone: that the warlike eloquence of the Motherland better adapt itself to the reality of our situation. As a commanding officer of Eritrean troops—which constitutes the truly "funny" aspect of this war—I declare that nothing is more inaccurate than the reports of "lightning-advances", "square legions", "dazzling offensives" and other literary garnish which is printed in our daily press. Never before have we heard such exaggerated words...

What do we think of European affairs, as they are referred to in metropolitan epistolography? Nothing. They do not even

enter our minds. England and the League of Nations are things which do not interest us.

Once, when we were in the Adua sector, news arrived—fabricated, no one knows how or by whom—that we were changing course and marching against a different enemy. An improvised banquet was held, during which, to be honest, we were much more concerned with eating than with talking, since we had been without food for several days. Eventually the Battalion Commander rose and said simply, as is his custom: "I am sure that the Battalion will do its duty against the new enemy, as it has done up to now. Long live the king!"

Based on what we have seen, what do we think of the Abyssinians, as soldiers? We've barely seen them! So far we occasionally see some remnants of fugitive bands. And it is our conviction and our fear that we will never see them en masse. Perhaps we are wrong, but in any case our contempt for the Abyssinians—as soldiers—is great. As bandits, we consider them quite bold and surprisingly fast. They act with a certain precision and only rarely are caught. They are the same ones who, after half an hour, circulate among our ranks, as friends, and bow down on the ground when we pass.

Coming here as a soldier, I was prohibited in advance from any criticism. And so, none of my words should be interpreted as such. I limit myself only to these simple observations:

1. Our conduct towards these populations is extraordinarily mild.
2. The Italian soldier, taken individually, well exceeds racial dignity.

The first point can be justified by our diplomatic needs and by the fact that the world has its eyes on us. This does not concern me. The second however, if one can sin by defect, is a serious one and is a symptom of a shortcoming which must be immediately corrected. There are two racisms: a European one—

and this we leave to the blondes on the other side of the Alps to concern themselves with; and an African one—and this is a racism which, if we do not yet know it, we must quickly learn it and adopt it. We will never be dominators unless we have a strong consciousness of our predestined superiority. One must not fraternize with negroes. One can not do it, one must never do it. At least not until they learn some civilization. I speak as a commander of black troops; by now I am attached to them and am as fond of them as I am of my family. But we must not give in to sentimentality. Moreover, it does not require any Freudian psychological intuition to realize that natives love whites only because they fear them or because they realize that whites are infinitely superior to themselves. No indulgences, no love affairs. Keep in mind that many families—our families—are going to settle here. The white man must be the master. Any sentimentalism that could jeopardize this must be disposed of.

My Battalion and I defeated everyone in the Tigray region, from west to east. I estimate—and I am a farmer and therefore a bit of a connoisseur—that some millions of Italians could live throughout the region here, even if not comfortably at first. But this "uncomfortability" pleases me: this land will finally be the necessary training ground for tough, callous and sublime Italians. The harsh climate will no longer be a mere word or invocation.

Except for a few halfwits, none of us wants the war to end. It may sound silly, but it is true. We soldiers have only one desire: to continue, to finally grab a hold of this elusive enemy and strangle it. We'd do it without flinching. All of us, more or less, have had a small taste of fire, and we already know what it is. We wish to settle accounts, and it seems to us that diplomatic channels would never lead to a real settlement. I will say, moreover: we sometimes feel a strange attitude towards aviation and artillery, who, with their admirable preliminary actions to our advances, annihilate everything in our path and almost always render our duty useless.

Except for some halfwits, none of us believe that a peace treaty—whatever it may be—can conclude our task here. We do not expect to be here for months, but for years. This is a boundless land, and not easy to tame. It will impose a very strict selection, it will be a rather harsh test which, in order to overcome, will require superhuman energies, both physically and morally.

This may bring a smile to those who are not on the front. But the Italians who see Africa from afar or who have a certain British-like metropolitan attitude, can do without coming or staying here. They can go back to Via Veneto...

A Surprising Adaptation

Published in Il Regime Fascista, October 4, 1938

Roberto Farinacci

For some time now we have been examining the statutes of the Italic Communes, in which the ecclesiastical authorities had uncontested dominion over all religious questions. Papal encyclicals, the canons of the councils and the pastoral letters of bishops all serve to demonstrate, without exception, how the Church persecuted the Jews, sometimes ruthlessly and cruelly. So when it is claimed today that the Vatican can not have an anti-Semitic spirit and indeed must be pro-Semitic — so they say in newspapers — we respond by invoking the words of the Jesuits, who were undoubtedly our precursors, since they followed our same thesis on the Jewish problem.

The Reverend Fathers never compromised on the Jewish problem. They considered the Jew a pest of mankind, they led an incessant doctrinaire and political struggle against the Jew, and they pointed out all the evil that the sons of Israel perpetrated in the various nations where they had lived. On August 30th, Il Regime Fascista briefly outlined a study published by La Civiltà Cattolica which, although it dates back to 1890, it is so fresh and current that one gets the impression that it could have been written yesterday. Until a few days ago, the leaders of the Jesuit magazine were pleased that we had heaped praise upon them and that we remembered and valued their very interesting historical and doctrinal material. In fact, they were so pleased that Mezzetti, author of the very recent book "The Jewish Question in a Century of Italian Culture", was given permission to reprint their well-known study on the Jewish Question in Europe.

Between us and the Reverend Fathers there was perfect love and respect, then suddenly the serenity was obscured by a dark cloud. Just the other day, on October 1st, *La Civiltà Cattolica* began to complain about the revival of their old study and emphasized that it was "inspired by the spectacle of Jewish invasion and arrogance half a century ago". What happened? Why are they doing a complete reversal? Clearly Fr. Tacchi Venturi, who oscillates between the Vatican Secretary of State and the Superior General of his Society, must have begged the journalists to pour a lot of Jewish water into Fascist wine. No doubt they must have been pressured by the Vatican's pro-Semitic attitude, which considers all earthly men to be brothers, all forming only one race, the human race, from the Zande of Africa to the first-born of France. We do not; we can not suddenly change our mentality, which was formed by the teachings of the Church which we believe to be excellent and always valid; you can not say they are valid one day and then deny them the next day. We can not accept such a glaring contradiction, especially when it bears the strong flavor of an anti-Fascist agenda.

The Jesuits' reversal however can not be regarded as an opportunistic maneuver, this does not add up to the honor of their historical intransigence, partly because this time the opportunism is based on elements that are too easy to counteract.

In fact, the Jesuit organ does not seem to take into account the fact that the invasion and arrogance of the Jews has grown even worse since the publication of their study a half century ago. The study in question did not have and does not have provisional value, rather it refers to the sad legacy left to our 20th century by victorious Jewish delinquency. Let us ask, are the "ethical-religious doctrines dictated and inculcated by the Talmud", the supreme code of the Jewish race, still valid among the Jews? Do they still and always constitute the "depraved madness" of the Jewish race? Yes or no? Are not the principles of

liberty, equality, fraternity and the rights of man, in reality, the rights of the Jew? Yes or no?

Nor should the astute Jesuit Fathers forget that for the Church there is no history, but there is always an equal struggle between good and evil, truth and error, and that evil and error are and always will be evil and error, while good and truth are and will always be good and truth. So how dare the Reverend Fathers declare that what was good and true half a century ago is not good and true today? Do they want to become philosophically temerarious as well?

As for the means adopted in Italy, time will show that we will be more moderate—perhaps even too moderate—compared to the more serious means invoked by *La Civiltà Cattolica*, which advocated confiscation of property and expulsion. So far we have not made any martyrs, and the world is amazed at our wisdom.

It is surprising therefore that today, as world Jewry worsens and becomes even more dangerous, *La Civiltà Cattolica* becomes milder.

In the collection of *La Civiltà Cattolica* we find that as recently as October 1922 they published that famous document which the magazine said can be found in the Vatican Archive, namely the letter of J. B. Simonini to the Jesuit Father Barruel which reported the confessions of leading wealthy Jews. The fourth of these confessions said:

"In Italy alone we [Jews] have more than eight hundred ecclesiastics, both secular and regular clergy, including parish priests, public professors, some bishops and some cardinals, and we are confident that one day we will even have a pope in our party."

And the tenth confession said:

"Consequently, the Jews promised themselves that in less than a century they would be masters of the world."

132 years have passed since the day these confessions were made, and if the Jews have not yet become what *La Civiltà Cattolica* feared, who should we thank?

We await the answer to this question.

The Concept of Race in Fascism

Extract from the monthly magazine Razza e civiltà, Anno I, No. 2, 1940

Arturo Sabatini

In a well-ordered State, care for the physical health of the people must come first.

MUSSOLINI
Parliament, May 26, 1927

The concept of race in Fascist Italy, in its deep biological, moral and political meaning, has its own physiognomy both in its origin and in its development. We must affirm the absolutely Italic aspect of such a profound problem; since it involves the life and the development of an ancient people which, as a result of a complex of common fundamental traits as well as others acquired over time, forms a clearly identifiable ethnic entity of 45 million people. This is due also to its special geographical position, perhaps the most unique among the human agglomerations of the continents which we anthropologists variously divide and classify:

"Italy has the privilege of being the most clearly identifiable Nation from the geographical point of view, and the most compactly homogeneous from an ethnic, linguistic and moral point of view."

The concept of race among Fascists did not originate from doctrinaire presuppositions; it derived from one Man—perhaps the only one in the world—who had the audacity not only of addressing but of resolving such a formidable problem, namely

the defense, strengthening, preservation and integration of our biological heritage: "to say that Fascism has imitated anyone or anything is simply absurd". The best proof of this assertion lies in the fact that our literature on race, understood in the modern sense, is very recent. But despite the scarcity of such literature there is a superb and enormous amount of work done by the Duce since his advent to power, which has always been done for the valorization of the race. He began this historic mission by arousing racial pride during that period which I would almost call formative:

"Here the nobility of our race is revealed. All of Italy today is of one heart. It all comes down to our essential qualities and gloriousness as Italians!"

It is necessary to take note of the date of those words: 1917.

Pride in one's own race represents the first stage in the subsequent development of a formidable systematically-implemented plan; and in 1920 it erupted into an even more precise and defined form:

"The first fundamental pillar of Fascism is Italianity... Now we vindicate the honour of being Italian, because in our wonderful and adorable Peninsula the most prodigious and marvelous history of mankind has taken place."

He already fixed one of the postulates of his mission, and in his speeches and writings—during a sad period in our history—he affirmed and proclaimed over and again "...we wish to unite in the same pride of race those in Corsica and those beyond the oceans to this great family of fifty million men" (1921); and in the same year—with certainty in his coming ascent to power, which he could already sense—he addressed the problem of race, setting it among the tasks which he aimed to solve:

"Fascism must deal with the problem of race. Fascists must occupy themselves with the health of the race, which is what makes history."

This warning, which became a commandment, made note of such a formidable problem in a clear and precise way and in a completely unique way. In 1922—already Duce of Fascism but not yet Head of Government—he affirmed the connection between race, civilization and history:

"To celebrate the Birth of Rome means to celebrate our kind of civilization, it means to exalt our history and our race."

With the dawn of a new and eminently constructive era:

"Italy is still responsible for giving civilization to all races, to all peoples... Rome is and always has been a testimony and imperishable document of the vitality of our race over the millennia... Fascism represents the prodigy of the Italian race which finds itself, redeems itself, and which wants to be great." (1923.)

And in the same year—in the beginning stages of his work as Head of Government—he proclaimed racial pride everywhere and more frequently, because the Italians understood its profound significance; in Piacenza, in Venice, in Milan to the members of the blue aristocracy, everywhere, with that incisive form of a lapidary language, a synthesis and notorious expression of a formidable thought and far-sighted conceptions which often allows him, with few words, to fix a program, to affirm a principle, to issue a warning:

"The eclipse of our race broke forth in 1915 and all the dormant, inextinguished virtues of our race sprang to the forefront and gave us immortal victory... This small and divine peninsula became too narrow for our race... This old and glorious Italic race knows sad hours, but it has never known the darkness of obscurity... I would like to

draw your attention to the miracle of this renewal of our race, which leaps to its feet upon the announcement of any trial, fights and wins."

He aimed to generate among his people a true and proper race consciousness, because he felt and understood the necessity of renewing its life cycle for the dawn of a new era of Italic civilization, which, through Fascism, was preparing itself for a civilizing mission in the world, a task already accomplished by our people on other occasions: "...a race which has made its fortune in very difficult conditions, that has dared, that has crossed seas and oceans, that has manifested sublime heroism in all ages."

At that time—and not only in Italy, it should be pointed out—race was a matter for anthropologists and amateurs, relegated to scientific institutes, limited to the doctrinaire and didactic fields, with a precious collection of skulls and fossil remains from different time periods, and was outside the confines of life. It did not enter politics; its vast, profound and frightful meaning was ignored by governments and by peoples. Mussolini was the first ruler to bring the concept of race to the forefront of life; because it contains and represents the very life of the peoples and their development; it is race which characterizes the collective personality of a people and its manifestations in art and thought, and it is also a biological entity which must be evaluated and considered in its morphological, physiological and psychological aspects.

The concept of race in Fascism—understood in the sense of defense, strengthening and selection—bears only one name: a Constructor for us, a Precursor for others. The various anthropologists, biologists, science enthusiasts and the other leaders noticed it a little later, when the formidable problem had already been clearly set by us, and its march was in progress since the beginning of the Fascist Era. In subsequent developments we

preserved the originality that is entirely specific to our movement.

It has by now been clearly demonstrated, through almost twenty years of work, that the Duce, in presenting and subsequently undertaking such a vast work with a harmonious and complete vision, felt all its profound significance, not only historical and political, but also biological. This subject must make the scholars of every Nation consider the mass of teachings that flow from it. Perhaps never before in history—until today—have problems of such vast significance, affecting the very life of a race, a people, or a Nation, been addressed in a totalitarian manner. The statement made in Turin, that "we will create the physical and moral type of the new Italian", is not an abstract phrase, because in that future there is already a present documented by the results obtained in the young generations which have already been deeply affected by this strongly constructive and modifying action. Results which I myself have been able to partially see by observing the many hundreds of young people called upon and selected for an important function in service of the Nation. They have undergone a true somatic transformation due to certain morphometric changes, such as the fundamental ones of thoracic perimeter and stature, compared to the generations of just a few years earlier.

The strengthening of our race must be the goal that drives young people and makes them aware of our millennial mission through the inherent qualities of our people who, being dormant, always rise to new splendor through the cycles of history with the emanation of genius. The new generations must be jealous guardians of this ancestral heritage, since Rome has never given up its place, and it illuminates the world again today with the light of its high civilizing mission:

"The Fascist government desires to go back and rediscover the unmistakable vestiges of Italian genius throughout the centuries. This is the most magnificent monument of gratitude and pride

that a generation, conscious of the renewed destinies of the Fatherland, can erect for the glorification of its own race."

In Italy the creators, the masters, the architects, the condottieri have always been a pure Italian trademark; the land where Caesar, Dante, Michelangelo and Napoleon were born likewise gave birth to the Man destined to build the new Empire of Rome, not only geographically but even more so spiritually and biologically, aware of the value of his people, susceptible and worthy of being shaped for new destinies by His hands, the hands of a Creator and Constructor.

"Our Italian race, in all times, has been capable of achieving miracles... We are proud to be Italian and to belong to this people that has 30 centuries of civilization... this people which three times has given to the astonished world the seal of its powerful civilization."

With pride in his own race, he felt the need to protect and defend this biological heritage, and he followed—also in his racial policy—that systematic constructive method that developed over time, and, as is his style, he immediately followed up every thought with action; and so, even before fixing its postulates in legislation, he gradually implemented a defense of the race in the practical field, specifying for the Italic people and for others a constructive, moral, defensive and selective concept of race: a new order.

The cornerstones, the crucial starting points for this cyclopean undertaking are represented first by the National Agency of Maternity and Infant Welfare: "We must pay serious attention to the destiny of the race, we must care for the race starting from motherhood and from infancy"; and by the agricultural land reclamation with the transplantation of families to rural areas, since "...it is you [rural folk] who represent the race in its most profound and immutable sense... race and soil are inseparable; through the soil the history of the race is made, while the race dominates and develops the soil."

Also by the demographic campaign, when the spectre of declining birth rates showed the gradual exhaustion of the biological and therefore historical cycle of some European peoples who are already facing or do not yet realize the frightening future, not yet aware of the absurd antithetic of number and quality: "fertile peoples have the right to imperialism, those who have the pride and the will to propagate their race on the face of the earth".

And by the precise rules that protect and impose physical education upon the youth "...who, in the parade, had the profound impression of the new race that Fascism is manfully molding".

And finally, after the conquest of the Empire, by the racial laws to safeguard and defend our biological heritage, to prevent and eliminate pollutions and admixtures, including the necessary purge of contaminations and deformations in the cultural and spiritual spheres, in order to provide an integral solution to the currents of thought worthy of the generations of Mussolini:

"History teaches us that empires are conquered by arms, but are held by prestige. And for prestige it is necessary to have a clear, severe racial consciousness, that establishes not only the differences, but also very clear superiorities."

In no other human agglomeration today are the concepts of race, people and Nation joined and united together in a harmonious vision as they are in our peninsula, spanned as it is by the most vital meridians, surrounded by the sea and by a high inaccessible mountain chain which, like the sea, isolates it from the continents, even from the biological point of view. These are the factors which led to the gradual formation of an ethnic group which, in its ancestral traits as well as in those traits acquired over the centuries, possesses a sum of common requirements; racial unity, which for us also includes the concept of people and Nation. This biological, political and moral complex profoundly affects the regenerative action desired by the Duce, which is the

defense, strengthening and selection of the race for an ever greater appreciation of the physical and psychological energies of our people, united in a single fascio: the Italic people:

"You know and everyone knows that also on the question of race we will follow the right path."

Orientations For Tomorrow: The Gold Trap

Published in Gerarchia, October 10, 1940

Roberto Pavese

If human life is measured in decades, then history—or rather that period of history which expresses a civilization—has the millennium as its unit of measurement. It follows also that what is contingent and periodic in history—such as the rhythm of development and decline, of life and death of civilizations—is considered, due to its centuries-long duration in the face of the brief tour of human life, a stable and genuine expression of a specific historical era.

Thus gold, despite being the dream and hope of men since time immemorial, is nevertheless a sign of the degeneration of civilizations, and yet it is still considered by most as a typical and necessary element of civilization itself.

If we examine the evolution of the cult of gold through history we will be able to draw many lessons. The cult of the "Golden Calf" was particularly popular in that kingdom of Israel from which, through the Old Testament, one would like to trace the history of humanity. On the other hand, if—even after the death of Moses—Christ saw it necessary to come to redeem the world created by Hebrew civilization, it is a sign that this civilization was now essentially oriented towards evil and that it represented, with all its characteristics and symbols, a degeneration and not a development.

History—written history—being, after all, the history of gold, is the history of a long degeneration. If we want to go back

to before this decline, to assess its primitive development, that is to say back to the heroic phase of history, we must, in fact, venture into prehistory, into legend, when vile metal—Satan's instrument—did not yet gain control over the soul of man.

I have had the opportunity to point out elsewhere how history, being critical and discursive, being a process that is reflective and not immediate, theoretical and not practical, is written when it is no longer occurring, when the creative current has already begun to stagnate. The truly constructive periods of the world and of civilizations are irretrievable, atheoretical, instinctive, guided by faith and not by reason; therefore prehistoric, mythical and transcendent compared to the critical and subsequent phase.

To assess the extent and assign limits to the historical process that is about to open up through our Revolution—which those who are accustomed to the unit of measurement of other recent revolutions, such as the French Revolution, really too modestly predicted the duration of only a century—, it must be borne in mind that, assuming that all the history we know (always more or less characterized by the cult of gold) represents a decline, it is precisely from this day forward that the true development of history begins. A development that begins with the slaughter of the Golden Calf and the starvation of King Midas; that is to say, it will be implemented through the substitution of the currency of gold with the currency of labour, and the siege of the old bourgeois economy by the new labour economy, until the old one finally capitulates. It is to be expected that the experiment of hunger, in the midst of mountains of gold, will provoke in the stubborn worshipers of vile metal a healthy awakening and a prompt abjuration of their economic and political beliefs.

It is appropriate to say that the Christian era truly begins with the "March on Rome". The 1,920 years which preceded it are the introduction of the book of that history—of that true history—which is being made today and which one day will be written,

when there is finally a period of rest, hopefully in the very distant future.

With regard to the concept of social justice, what Fascism did—and still more what it sets out to do—corresponds exactly to the spirit and letter of the Christian gospel. The contempt of wealth, of luxury, of comfort, a sense of human solidarity, undeterred even in the face of the enemy, the mystical attitude of renunciation and sacrifice in front of the Idea, which are characteristics of the Fascist conception of life, are also exquisitely Christian beliefs. Between Fascism and Christianity there can be no conflict, because they have the same moral goals.

When adequately assessing the immense scope of the Fascist Idea, in its aim of social and political justice through the overcoming of the myth of gold, and therefore of capital and wealth, one cannot but begin to realize the immeasurable obstacle that gold and wealth—with all the business that is connected to it—have always represented for the implementation of true justice in the world. It can be said that gold, as a medium of exchange, was invented specifically to create and perpetuate the state of injustice and oppression in the world. So let us try to look at things a little more closely.

There was a period of the British Empire that we could call heroic—if one can use the term 'heroism' in reference to predatory animals—when that nation of pirates and filibusters fought without the use of intermediaries; and there was a time when, after obtaining a wealth of goods and precious metals from the barter of slaves—the fruit of their extra-continental raids—the English realized that there was no need to work for a living at all, because one could live very well and get rich through the work of others. The Jews and thieves in general are of the same opinion: except that the former, being more clever, know how to maneuver on the margins of the law by acting in grand style and, through gold, shielding themselves from the law, while

the latter, who work by the minute and without too much malice, are as a rule punished with the full rigor of the law.

But as the heroic age passed to the bourgeois age, from the age of direct battle to the age of mercenaries, the strength of the arm had to be progressively replaced with the cunning of the mind, especially when the profitable trade of slaves inevitably came to an end; it had to be remedied by inventing a more or less elegant trick to otherwise bend individuals and peoples to their own will, giving them freedom to enjoy what was only a more refined form of slavery, with chains of gold rather than iron.

After getting their hands on all the gold and wealth in the world, the trick of living off their dupes was soon established: the gold standard became the basis for exchange, without which labour alone would not even be sufficient to earn bread. "If we"—so said the old slave traders—"place our gold between labour and bread, through the domination or monopoly of trade, then by blackmailing labour and production we can change the old iron chain of the convict into a gold chain. One way or another the world will always be our servant."

Hence the more or less elegant taxation of the sweat of peoples, one-tenth, which often became a sharecrop and worse, between master and colonist. For the British Empire the distinction between colonies and sovereign nations was more geographical than substantial: the difference lay only in the method of domination; that docility that was obtained in the colonies—when necessary—through the iron of mercenaries, for the "free" Nations was instead obtained through the gold of Jewish-Masonic corruption, through the intrigues and blackmail of high finance.

That in the days of corsairs and in places that did not yet know liberty and international law, when values and lands belonged to the first arrival; when caravans and stagecoaches were at the mercy of robbers, and human rights and social groups

were guaranteed only by the payment of bounties to criminal organizations; that in such historical situations certain systems of rapacity and violence could exist successfully is also conceivable to a certain extent, especially when those who suffered the oppression were inferior races, or simple, ignorant and servile peoples. But that in the middle of the twentieth century, after one hundred and fifty years of adoration of the fetish of liberty and the exaltation of human rights; after Rousseau, Proudhon and Marx, that we have long been able to passively accept—indeed consciously support with economic mimicry—the tyrannical domination that medieval and anti-European England by force of inertia has continued to exert over Europe and the world, this is a certain sign of the irremediable decadence of the modern world, which, under the democratic label, has now been reduced to the same subjugation of the colonized peoples. Just look at France, the cradle of democracy.

Who was the first to clearly break away from such a disgraceful decadence? Who was aware of the historical monstrosity of a colossal organism that survived only on the ignorance and cowardice of peoples and on the logical inconsistency of an Empire which, now reduced to men without leadership capabilities and without brains, badly maintained its prestige only with a simulacrum of surviving power? Who was the first to throw off the heavy—albeit invisible—chains that the Masonic institutions kept the so-called sovereign Nations shackled to? Mussolini. Who was the first to cause the decrepit facade of British prestige to stagger, openly challenging the old world coalesced against us at the time of the sanctions? Mussolini. Mussolini understood it and willed it. Prior to him, it was either not understood or was not willed hard enough: at times one can be intelligent, but still be weak, indecisive and decadent.

What is the *deus ex machina* of British hegemony? The ability to evade spirits and wills, to corrupt the best men of various peoples with gold.

While the more or less barbaric peoples of the colonies were domesticated, tamed, enervated by alcohol and by their opium generously provided by Albion, towards the peoples of the so-called free and sovereign Nations they acted more refined with the drugs of a culture made ad hoc in the distilleries of the Masonic lodges — which was, in effect, a culture of pathogenic bacilli for society and for the State — to be served up to the intellectuals, and more easily subjugate them to the plutocratic wagon, i.e. to bourgeoisize them. A bourgeois is a fool who, dazzled by the mirror of a wealth that is always promised and never bestowed, pulls the ruler's wagon with willing resignation. A similar method was used towards the "evolved and conscious" working classes, dazzling them with the mirror of the "sun of the future". And these same methods can be seen in the most recent, deadly trick: England's "selfless protection" of neutral States and minor powers in general.

The European woman has her small share of responsibility in the easy success of similar crude tricks. It is through her that the small practical psychology of these professional mystifiers has leveraged the development of their oblique machinations. If woman, from Eve onward, easily yields to the enticements of Satan, man on the other hand is completely disarmed in the face of a woman's flattery. If Satan instills in the female heart a love of luxury and wealth, man goes out of his way—even at the cost of miserably compromising his own conscience—to satisfy the whims and vanity of the woman he loves.

Due to this congenital weakness of the European woman—and not only—in the face of bourgeois suggestion, the implementation of the imperial demo-plutocratic plan of world domination has been made easier, through that progressive deviation of the citizens, so that within a few generations the heir of the *civis romanus* has been reduced to the miserable role of the bourgeois man.

The modern woman who from adolescence confides to her friends her own life plan: to enter marriage not for love, but more so to find her desired type, in view of the possibility of "taming" her man without effort and making him as docile and inoffensive as a dog on a leash; the modern woman, I repeat, was the most precious ally of British imperialism. Because of this bourgeois spirit that penetrates her to the bones, the modern woman belonged by right to Freemasonry: she constituted that petty Masonry, no less widespread than that of the lodges, and has plagued the atmosphere of history, bringing men to moral asphyxia. It is not for nothing that Marshal Pétain pointed to hedonism—the intensification of which has done much to bring about the well-known frivolity and vanity of French women—as the main cause of the ruin of France.

Fortunately for us, this civic indignity of the modern woman did not manifest itself among all European peoples with the same level of gravity. It is certain that the places where God is more heavily punishing with war today, are precisely those same countries where the conduct of women has been less exemplary. However, even in Italy there are certain social strata in which woman's conscience needs to be severely corrected. The anti-bourgeois campaign, which will be one of the main objectives of the Regime in the post-war period, will have to have as its first objective the adaptation of women's conscience to the pressing needs of our imperial policy, since it is precisely here that the true familial root of the bourgeois spirit is found.

Not for nothing was gold called Satan's instrument. All that there is of vice and baseness in the world—idleness, vanity, rapacity, speculation, exploitation, usury, corruption, injustice, cruelty, luxury, lust—is the work of gold. A natural enemy of law and order, gold subverts everything, poisons everything, peoples and consciences: ...it creates the shameless opulence of an oligarchy of delinquents, who through gold and through the stupid adoration and hope of the world for what is the root of all its evils, have always found the weapon of defense and offense, of

immunity and exploitation. We must create an economic system where speculation is both morally illicit and materially impossible. We must create an extremely rarefied economic atmosphere for all those various parasites of labour and intelligence—from the stock market player, to the commodity and labour broker, to the shareholder of anonymous companies, to the smoke seller, to the profiteers and loan sharks of all kinds—who do nothing but Englishly and Judaically suck production and anemize consumption.

Once gold has been abolished and the currency reduced to the simplest and most primordial function of exchange between production and consumption, labour will be automatically protected and immunized from the pitfall of that exploitation: with a very simple surgical procedure we can heal and moralize the whole economic system. Abolishing gold and the currency attached to gold means tearing the iron of trade from the rapacious hands of businessmen of all types; it means making the atmosphere unbearable for the rats of that pestiferous sewer known as high international finance, which for this reason would be forced to scatter, like bugs from a fumigated house.

We must give an impression of greater seriousness to life and severity of conduct; the woman must be guided by all suitable means to have a contempt for wealth, luxury, jewels, all that is superficial frill and tinsel; teach her to look more at substance rather than appearance; educate her in a superior sense of personal dignity that makes her shun as offensive the idea that one must evaluate her based on the elegance of her clothes and the weight of her jewels. It is time that certain exhibitionism of wealth, certain delusions such as collecting wild junk simply because it shines and sparkles, is considered for what it really is: a clear sign of inferiority, not only moral, but also mental. Moral, because it reveals pride and malice, in the desire to humiliate others, to arouse the envy of others; mental, because such a person does not understand how stupid it is to believe that

human and social value is something like that of a mannequin or a jewelry box.

We must create and consolidate a social atmosphere in which wealth—and especially the ostentation of it—is no longer viewed with envy, but with contempt; an atmosphere in which the fundamental postulate of the new economy becomes the concept that property is legitimate only on the condition of being a means and not an end in itself: property that degenerates into wealth is profoundly immoral and despicable, because, being the result of an impairment...

Notes on the Fascist Doctrine of Race

Published in Gerarchia, July 1942

Pasquale Pennisi

RACE - IDEA - CIVILIZATION

1. Race is a psycho-physical reality which defines man as a temporally living being, connected to a genealogy. This is one of the determining factors of the psychological and somatic expression of a person, and — through the insuppressible relationship between the psychological world and the spiritual world in the human person — is also able to determine spiritual expression.

2. This determination concerns the mode of expressing psychological and spiritual manifestations, not their mode of being. That is to say, race influences the traits with which the person expresses his own qualities, but not the substantial content of them. Therefore it is not possible to adhere to racial determinism as the legitimate explanation for a total vision of life and the world.

3. This is given by the idea. It is the idea, not race, that determines the way of being of the human person, and therefore the substantial content of his qualities. The idea is "form"; race is "matter". A race without an idea can not act politically, that is to say, historically and socially; conversely, the action of an idea can not be completed and perfected in concrete historical reality if not incarnating itself in a race capable of expressing it.

4. Civilization is not, therefore, a creative act of the race, but of the idea, embodied by that race which is most capable of expressing it completely and perfectly. At the core of Civilization there is always, outwardly, a race; inwardly, an idea. This is the determining engine of history; the necessary instrument in this determination.

5. The races are not "pure", but are "small histories". For the whole of humanity this is due to the original fall, and for each race in particular is due to its historical vicissitudes as a people. Nevertheless, for each race there exists a degree of purity as the ideal-limit to strive towards. However, racial purity can never be empirically reached in its totality because it would mean a return to the Edenic state prior to original sin. The degree of purity to which the historical races can work towards as an ideal-limit is constituted: 1) by the integrity of their relative psychological-spiritual characteristics; 2) by the accomplished ability of these races to express themselves through the bio-physical characteristics of the race.

RACE - HISTORY - POLICY

1. Not every race is capable of expressing every idea. In order that matter can adequately serve the form, a positive correspondence between the character of the idea and the nature of the race, through which it seeks its expression, — that is to say, between the content of the idea and the expressive ethyl of the race — is necessary.

2. Ideas, in terms of their character, are divided into two categories: Tradition and Subversion. The first is historically centripetal, hierarchical, social and tends towards transcendence.

The second is historically centrifuge, egalitarian, individualistic and tends towards immanence. The ideas of the first category are epitomized by the Italian race; the ideas of the second category are epitomized by the Jewish race.

3. A nation is a race observed in the dynamics of its historical life. Empirically, every idea can seek its expression through any race. When there is a positive correspondence between idea and race, the people tend to reach their spiritual and political power. When there is a negative correspondence between idea and race, the people descend into a period of decadence.

4. The race of a nation is recognized, therefore, through its history. The historical analysis of its periods of power and decadence, in relation with the ideas embodied in each one, testifies to the nature of the people. The means used to embody ideas testify to its traits, that is to say, to the qualities of the race. Recognizing the reality of race from a political point of view means proceeding with such a historical inquiry and implementing its political consequences.

5. In this sense, politics appears as a power enhancer of the race, because, proposing an idea that is positively corresponding to its nature, and ordering according to this the manifestations of its traits, can lead it back to its purity, i.e. enhance it and, if decayed, dignify it and rectify it.

RACE - HIERARCHY - CONSCIENCE

1. Like any other natural expression of human life, races are ordered among themselves in a hierarchy. This hierarchy does not, however, depend upon a material classification of the

external, biological and somatic characteristics of each race, but upon a spiritual classification of its internal, psychological and spiritual characteristics.

2. Every race is itself; that is to say, it is characterized by its own traits which determines its specific attitudes within the harmonious coexistence of humanity. Since the hierarchy of races is based on their internal characteristics, the hierarchical scale of the races corresponds to that of the values with which the specific attitudes of each particular one are excellently directed.

3. The races constitute a reality of the temporal life of man. Since in this the highest value — the one which reduces others in harmonic unity — is Politics, the highest degree of racial hierarchy is held by that race whose traits are most capable of expressing the idea of Empire, which is the excellent idea of Politics.

4. This hierarchy can be looked upon *sub specie aeternitatis* in consideration of the immanent providential plan in history, revealed by past degenerations: as such it represents the *terminus ad quem* of Politics. But it can also be looked upon under the species of its contingent actuality, and as such it represents the *terminus a quo* of politics and gives us the index of the vitality of the race at a given moment.

5. This index of racial vitality is measured by the current correspondence of a race to its providential place in the hierarchy of races; that is to say, from the current degree of adhesion of a race to its historically revealed vocation. The vitality of the race is due to the consciousness it has of itself.

6. The task of Politics is to take care of and raise the degree of racial vitality, i.e. to maintain or bring the people back to their proper place in the racial hierarchy. Politics accomplishes this

task by maintaining and strengthening the consciousness that the race has of itself.

ITALICITY - ROMANITY - REVOLUTION

1. There exists an Italian race: it is the one which descended from an original Aryan-Mediterranean ethnos and created Roman civilization. The internal characteristics (mental and spiritual traits) that define the Italian race corresponds in its natural substantial content to the typical "virtues" of Classical Romanity, and constitutes its formal expression.

2. Classical Roman Civilization reached its apogee in the historical epoch of Augustus — which corresponds to the historical individuation of the Italian Nation — expressing the idea of Empire. According to the providential plan of history, this Civilization prepared the advent of Christianity, with which it merged. Since then, Tradition, Civilization and Romanity are unique and synonymous terms.

3. Tradition lost its power of historical initiative when the Italian race ceased to express the idea of Empire. In the hands of other peoples this idea was expressed only in a pure reactionary way, and was therefore incapable of acting historically, abandoning the political initiative to the ideas of Subversion, epitomized especially in the French Revolution of 1789 and its consequences.

4. Fascism is Tradition as it incorporates the idea of Rome and is irreconcilably opposed to the entire world born from the so-called "immortal principles" of 1789. It is equally Revolution, as it is opposed to every reactionary interpretation of Tradition, and

constitutes a new and original incarnation of the idea of Empire expressed through the Italian race. It may be defined, therefore, as a traditional Revolution, Italian in origin, in center and in morality. In Fascism, Tradition is revived in an original way: it tends, therefore, to actualize Civilization in its new historical phase.

RACE - UNIVERSALITY - EMPIRE

1. The new phase of Civilization can only be determined by the idea of Empire through the political and historical action of the Italian race. Herein lies the necessity for Fascism to recognize and strengthen the Italian race. The Italian race stands as the seed of the Empire, fertilized by its conscience; and, as such, as an integrating, non-divisive force of imperial universality. There is a kind of historical fatality (a providential vocation) between Empire and Italicity; there can not be a true actualization of the Imperial idea except through the vitality and activity of the Italian race, and there can not be a historical period of complete vitality of the Italian race without it tending towards actualizing the idea of Empire. This relationship fully expresses the reality of its synthesis with Romanity.

2. Universality is the opposite of internationalism; the latter is always centrifugal (Subversion); the former always centripetal (Tradition) and therefore needs a center. This center can only be an idea (form) which — when it comes to political universality — is embodied in a race (matter) and expresses itself through the historical action of said race.

3. The Italian race, recalled to its conscience by Fascism, stands as the imperial race. This means that it stands as the first

of the races of the Empire: that which historically and politically embodies and expresses the idea, and which recognizes its vocation in giving meaning to imperial universality, hierarchically and harmoniously ordering around itself those other races called to participate.

RACISM - AXIS - ORDER

1. Racism, therefore, is not the determinant of the Fascist vision of life and the world, but is one of its elements, or rather, a means of actualization. It is divided into political racism and scientific racism. The former aims to establish the reality of a race and the idea that is expressed through it; to arouse and strengthen the consciousness of the race; to systemize and clarify the spiritual and doctrinal relations between this consciousness and the other instruments and elements of the vision of life and the world. The latter aims to study the various races in their mental-physical realities, and has an instrumental function with regard to the former.

2. Political racism has a preeminent function in the spiritual and historical developments of Axis policy, through which the resurgence of the Imperial idea is implemented. While the Axis gives historical life to the myth-reality of that Roman-Germanic community, through which the most recent vital incarnations of the Imperial idea have been realized, political racism brings the two pillars of the Axis closer to the realization of this synthesis.

3. Political racism leads the Italian race back to consciousness of itself, which was weakened in the previous subversive historical period under the impulse of the internationalistic idea; in other words, it makes the race capable of realizing the idea of

Empire once again, placing itself at the center. On the other hand, political racism, by bringing Germanism back to the myths of its early pre-Roman origins (the trinity of Siegfried, Wagner and Goethe have replaced Luther, Kant and Hegel as the primary sources of inspiration for Germans), tends to detach it from the anti-Roman Protestant-Liberal ideological subversion by laying the historical premises of a new spiritual Romanization.

4. Romanization means the filtration of those fundamental moral virtues which for the Italian race are the substantial natural content of its formal character, and which for other races becomes something to acquire from the Italians. Romanization is the soul of the Empire in its complete and perfect realization.

5. Political racism must be an instrument of the Imperial idea being realized among all the peoples of the New Order and therefore must aim to preserve the originality and thus the ethnic and cultural vitality of each of them even within their coordinated and hierarchical political and economic communities. Only a well-understood political racism can preserve Universality (Tradition) from degenerating into Internationalism (Subversion), reconciling in a superior synthesis (Empire) the truths contained in the two political principles of nationality and vital living space.

6. In the applicative and political graduality and in the universal contemporaneity of the New Order, our political racism, while affirming the imperial nature of the Italian race and its providential vocation to implement the idea of Empire for the West through the axial resurrection of the Roman and Germanic community, affirms for the East the imperial nature of the Japanese race, whose internal characteristics are similar to those of Romanity.

The Fasces and the Cross

Published in La Rassegna nazionale, 1941

Ugo Ciuchini

In the present time every Italian of the home front, whatever place he occupies in the social hierarchy, must have a greater sense of responsibility and justice, and indeed feel more alive, in his dealings with fellow citizens, that sense of human brotherhood, which is not only a Christian duty, but the spontaneous expression of national and racial solidarity, cemented now by the blood spilled by our generous brothers on the battlefield.

In order to win the war we need austere virtue, not the unleashing of vulgar passions.

Let us recall the words of Marshal Pétain and the other French patriots before the disaster of France: "The defeat was due to the pleasure-loving spirit of the French, to their neglect of a moral conscience and honesty."

We must use all our spiritual and moral resources. At the forefront of these is the religious sentiment of the Italian people, the religious sentiment that we were nursed with on our mothers knee, and which is the purest and noblest heritage we have received from our fathers.

Let us imitate the example of our ancestors, beginning with the ancient Romans, who Livy calls "men filled with religion, who did not undertake any civil or military venture without having propitiated the gods with sacrifices and without consulting the priests." Let us remember that one of the primary reasons for the happiness of the Republic, as Machiavelli noted

in Chapter XI of his "Discourses on Livy", was the deep fear of God by many of the people.

The Italian people — the heir of the Roman people — is intimately Catholic; and, also looking at things from a simply pragmatistic point of view (when the light of faith is not shining in the soul), it is necessary to capitalize on this most powerful spring of religious feeling.

This, combined and fused with the love of Fatherland, creates miracles of superhuman fortitude and heroism, like that of the Alcazar. Franco's Spain was able to break free from the twist of the Red hydra, because aided by Mussolini's Italy and by the profound Catholic faith which animated his soldiers, who knew how to truly fight "pro aris et focus" (for God and country).

"Italy is Catholic, immutably Catholic in her tradition and in her instinct..." (Alfredo Oriani). Italy is Catholic by right and by fact, Catholic in mind and in heart.

Fascism from the outset understood the importance of harmony between the sentiment of Fatherland and the sentiment of Religion of the Italians.

Italy, which has the immense privilege of having in her bosom the Chair of St. Peter, knows its vocation.

While remaining in a distinct field and autonomous of its civil, political and economic realizations, in the designs of Providence it is destined to cooperate in the restoring and civilizing work of the Church over Europe and the world; especially by the effectiveness of example, realizing its own political life and Christian social order as it does now, brandishing the sword against Bolshevism—the denier of all Christian and civil principles.

Owing to close links existing between Italy and the Church, the cause of Italy, which recognizes its own vocation, becomes the cause of God (and the cause of God always ends in triumph);

to fight for the Fatherland is to fight also for the Faith of the Fatherland, "pro aris et focus" (for God and country), according to the classical Roman motto; it is to fight for a better Europe, more harmonious, more just and happier; it is to fight for Christ. Europe "has needs and is thirsting for a new inner discipline and a new spiritual unity" and "no one can say what to prepare to history the magnificent Christian vitality." (Alfredo Oriani).

For the regeneration of Europe it is necessary to reconstruct intellectual and moral unity (the remote—but fundamental—cause of the current war is due precisely to this lack of spiritual unity, based on a single criterion of morality and justice universally accepted); this arduous task can not be accomplished without Rome, to which all European nations can look towards with confidence, as that which always keeps alive and vital the ferments (Christianity and Romanity) which previously, having merged with the peculiarities of the strong and loyal Germanic race, produced European civilization.

And a civilization, as acutely observed by the Secretary of the Florentine Republic (Book III, Chapter I, of the "Discourses on Livy") does not regenerate by reducing its principles. The biggest problem of the unitary reconstruction of the Europe of tomorrow is to unite Latinity and Germanism. And this union, while remaining distinct — each of the two worlds with their particular characteristics — may be accomplished, in an intimate and permanent way, under a "unified religious conception", which Hitler (*Mein Kampf*) lamented as missing in modern society and considered it necessary, because "for the masses, faith is almost always the only foundation of a moral conception of the world", and without moral foundations the world can not exist.

The history of Rome itself teaches us that empires are formed not only by the sword, but also with virtue, and that when there is no virtue, they become corrupt and come apart.

This means that the Cross in the center of the flag must not be a mere heraldic symbol, but the expression of an entire program.

Already in 1830 Ciro Menotti in his plan of the revolutionary movement entitled "Ideas for organizing the intelligences of all the cities of Italy for their independence, unity and freedom," he stated that "the banner of three colors, green, red and white" which was to be the flag of the regenerated Italy, was "also composed of the Cross", because it is (these are his own words) "the symbol of Liberty and of Religion".

The evidence demonstrates that, since the beginning of the Risorgimento, the holy ideals of Fatherland and Religion were inextricably united in the hearts of the vast majority of those who aspired and conspired for the independence and unity of Italy.

It was always the radiant ideal of the divine Alighieri, perennial interpreter and tutelary genius of the Italian race, which dominates our history: the ideal symbolized by the union of the Aquila and the Cross.

As with Dante, love for the Fatherland and love for Christ has always been united in the heart of the Italian people, whom "in its flower never withered" — as writes Giovanni Papini — "was more Dantesque" than many of his representatives.

And therefore the union of the Fasces and the Cross, symbols of the universal ideas of law and of God, is sealed in the fate of Italy and the Europe of tomorrow; because the new world that will emerge from the war will be the harmonization of Fascism and Christianity, that is, from the union of justice and love, the only two principles capable of reorganizing the world of tomorrow.

The Fasces and the Cross, symbolizing Romanism and Catholicism, are and forever will be — so long as Italy will be as

the genius of the Duce is today, at the height of its destiny — the ideals that will guide her to true greatness.

The Emperor Constantine, after impressing on the shields and banners of his legionaries the Cross of Christ, "ad Saxa rubra" defeated Maxentius; and from that day, in which the Fasces and the Roman Aquila were joined to the Cross, there appeared in the world the most splendid of auroras, the dawn of Christian civilization.

In this grave hour for the fate of the Fatherland and European civilization, let us look up.

In the bluish skies of Italy there is still ideally shining, radiant with superhuman splendors and consoling as a divine promise, the Cross that appeared to Constantine...

O Italy, "in hoc signo vinces" — in this sign you shall conquer.