

**The Ventotene Papers**

**Altiero Spinelli - Ernesto Rossi**

**THE VENTOTENE  
MANIFESTO**



**THE ALTIERO SPINELLI INSTITUTE  
FOR FEDERALIST STUDIES**

**The Ventotene Papers**

---

**Altiero Spinelli - Ernesto Rossi**

**THE VENTOTENE  
MANIFESTO**

---

**THE ALTIERO SPINELLI INSTITUTE  
FOR FEDERALIST STUDIES**

## The Ventotene Manifesto: the Only Road to follow

If we wish to talk about the Ventotene Manifesto we must first of all speak about its author, Altiero Spinelli. Even in his style of life, inspired by an exemplary simplicity and a realism which feared no truth, however bitter, Altiero Spinelli incarnated, in a perfect way, Max Weber's conception of the political hero. Weber, I may recall, concludes his essay on *Politics as a profession* with these words: "Politics consists in a slow and tenacious surmounting of great difficulties, which must be achieved with passion and discerning at the same time. It is perfectly true, as history has borne out time and again, that what is possible would never be achieved if someone in the world did not keep on trying to achieve the impossible. But whoever attempts to do so must be a leader, and not only that - in the sober sense of the word, he has to be a hero as well. And whoever is neither, must, from the outset forge that temper which will allow him to remain steadfast when all hopes collapse, for otherwise he will not even be able to fulfil the little which really can be achieved today. Only the man who is sure he will not fail, despite a world too stupid or vulgar, from his point of view, to appreciate what he is offering, and who can still stand up and say 'never mind, let's press on!', only such a man has a vocation for politics".

Nothing better could be said about the character of Altiero Spinelli and nothing else need be stated. We should merely add that he was a hero of politics because he was, to use the word in its most sober sense, a hero of reason. His stature as a great European was no longer questioned in the last years of his life when he was

Copyright © by *The Altiero Spinelli Institute for Federalist Studies*  
Ventotene (Italy)

Distributed in Great Britain by *Federal Trust for Education and Research* - Europe House - 1a Whitehall Place, London SW1A 2DA

ISSN 0394 4204

more often quoted as one of the “founding fathers” of a United Europe. But to judge his work we need to say something more and to be more precise. I believe that time, which sifts out enduring values and the meaning of events, will judge him for what he really was: one of the major politicians of our time, a real innovator. Certainly no-one else has ever founded his political project purely on reason, as he did. Even though he was Italian, Spinelli did not consider Italy as a reality to be accepted before having submitted it to rational examination. Likewise, though converted to democracy after his Leninist experience in early youth, he did not consider the great ideologies of our political tradition (liberalism, democracy, and socialism) as the exclusive framework for thought, or as mental limits with which to bound his political analysis.

Thus he raised himself to a viewpoint that permitted him to see that there is a fundamental contradiction in political action, as it was and generally still is carried out, pulling it further and further away from reality. Briefly, the contradiction is this: despite the increasingly unitary character of historical events, which is creating an increasingly united world, the entire political process, badly administered by the political class and the scientific and intellectual class, is still almost exclusively aimed at making changes within one's own nation, as if that were enough to resolve the great, dramatic problems of continental and world dimensions. Even peace, in this outlook, is thought of as achievable through a pure and simple sum of national policies.

On the contrary, Spinelli took the opposite position. When at the end of the Second World War, the question was the political framework within which to build the future, the parties proposed the national road and chose the reconstruction of the nations as their priority. Spinelli was practically alone in proposing the European option and in making his priority the construction of Europe, to be achieved, not through the procedures of foreign affairs, but by a democratic struggle based on supranational and constitutional criteria.

He was naturally capable of the superior realism of a man who knows how to innovate, because he did not delegate the task of

action to others or some mythical entity. He saw reality unveiled because he had freed himself from the self-mystification which resides in traditional ideologies and national thinking. He had fought Fascism and had been in prison for it. He did not make a pact with anyone, he was ready to fight alone, and he laid down his challenge. On the basis of experience, we can state the following. *First*, there has been no national recovery, but instead an attempt by governments to build Europe. *Secondly*, this attempt which is awkward and uncertain, in consequence of the ineffectiveness of the method adopted (the intergovernmental method based on foreign policy), has left Western Europe half-way between unity and division. *Thirdly*, precisely by using the constitutional method, which everyone considered utopian, Spinelli twice succeeded in bringing Europe to the threshold of real unity, i.e. an early form of federal government (in 1951, with De Gasperi he tried to put the European army, then being constructed, under democratic European political power; in 1984, as a member of the European Parliament he tried again with the draft Treaty for European Union). But that was not all. By giving life to a political struggle based no longer on established (national) power or designed to win this power, but based instead only on reason and designed to create supranational powers, Spinelli started a decisive political experiment.

What Spinelli thought up then is, in fact, the only way to extend democratic control from the national sphere to the international sphere, still dominated by *raison d'état* and thus by the reason of weapons which for as long as they exist will always be an alternative to democracy. It is, therefore, the only road that can be followed to entrust the political task to reason, and raise political skill to the level of scientific and technical skill, as the world situation demands. It is, in fact, the only way to resolve the dramatic problems of our time, and put mankind on the road to real civilization: organized peace with a world government and equality among all peoples, according to the everlasting teachings of Kant. What matters, then, is to know that this road cannot be followed without, as Spinelli did in the Ventotene Manifesto, refuting national borders as the boundaries of political struggle,

beyond which there is as yet no active political thought nor development of political will.

The facts have made it possible to ascertain that transcending national boundaries is a possible choice. Many federalists, after Spinelli, have made this choice. I would like to suggest through my personal recollections, that this choice really does lie within everybody's reach when they engage themselves in politics, provided they do not neglect the reason lying in every man. These are my recollections. I met Spinelli in 1953. I had been a member of the European Federalist Movement ever since I learned of its existence (in 1945), but I considered it an organization which was more cultural than political. In the first instance, political action means participating in the fight for power in one's own nation, and, despite hating Italy, this is what I did as a left-wing liberal. But I was forced to abandon, one by one, all the positions on which I had settled because every time I was forced to accept that they were completely useless. In this way, I found myself first outside the Italian Liberal Party, which was not able to opt for the Republic in Italy's 1946 referendum, and then outside all preconstituted political party patterns in an attempt to achieve unification of the democratic left and the complete democratization of Italy's Communist Party, i.e. aiming for an Italy in which there was an alternative in government in the full sense of the term, and in which people no longer voted — as they almost all did at the time — for either Russia or America. This was the Italy with which I thought it would be possible to construct Europe, in which I fully recognized myself.

But this prospect did not make any progress. So I began to realize that there was a structural defect in this design, shared at the time by many anti-Fascists in Italy and which came up time and again. It was not possible, to democratize Italy fully, to tackle organizational aspects (the transformation and unification of left-wing parties). What was necessary was to strive for a great political design, one which would provoke a profound change in ideas and positions, and which would also, as a result, bring about precisely the renewal of parties. But then I realized that the great design that Italy needed was European unification. Europe as a

starting point, and not, as it is usually seen as a point of arrival for renewal.

But an extremely difficult problem arose with this reversal of the priorities, namely a political struggle not designed to obtain national power, but the creation of European power. No-one had apparently thought of this, though in actual fact one person had: Spinelli. And he had given a following to his thinking, the European Federalist Movement, which suddenly seemed to me to be the only political organization with a strategic value. I wrote to him, I went to see him, I began my action in the European Federalist Movement, and I still wonder to this day what I would have done if he had not introduced this new behaviour into historical reality.

This is the fact that should be stressed when we wish to establish the meaning of his work. He was able to create a new type of political behaviour and demonstrated its possibility: for this reason he can be followed. In this respect, we need to bear in mind that he managed to accomplish this because his thinking was up to the task. What this thinking was he tells us himself in an autobiographical passage which relates to the years of internment in Ventotene: "When asked by Rossi who as a Professor of Economics had been authorized to correspond with him a long time before, Einaudi sent him two or three little books on English federalist literature which flourished at the end of the thirties thanks to Lord Lothian's efforts. Apart from Lionel Robbins' book *The Economic Causes of War*, which I translated and which was published by Einaudi, I do not remember either the titles or the authors of the other books. But their analysis of the political and economic perversion to which nationalism leads, and their reasoned presentation of the federalist alternative, have remained in my mind to this very day as a revelation. Since I was looking for clarity and precision in my thinking, my attention was not attracted by the hazy and contorted ideological federalism of Proudhon and Mazzini, but by the clean and precise thinking of these British federalists, in whose writings I found a good method for analyzing the situation into which Europe was falling, and to draw up alternative prospects".

This is what has to be done and what all can undertake, now that Spinelli has opened up the road. Everybody can learn about this thinking, and adopt it as their own criterion for knowledge of contemporary history and political action. And with this thinking to guide them everybody can adopt the position described in the Ventotene Manifesto with these words: "The dividing line between progressive and reactionary parties no longer coincides with the formal line of more or less democracy, or the pursuit of more or less socialism, but the division falls along a very new and substantial line: those who conceive the essential purpose and goal of the struggle as being the ancient one, the conquest of national political power and those who see the main purpose as the creation of a solid international State". This is the road for Europe. This is the road for peace.

Mario Albertini

### Editorial note

The Ventotene Manifesto, whose full title is "For a Free and United Europe. A draft manifesto", was drawn up by Altiero Spinelli and by Ernesto Rossi (who wrote the first part of the third chapter) in 1941 when they were both interned on the island of Ventotene. After being distributed in mimeographed form, a clandestine edition of the Manifesto appeared in Rome in January 1944 published with two essays by Altiero Spinelli: "The United States of Europe and the various political tendencies" (written in the second half of 1942) and "Marxist Politics and Federalist Politics", written between 1942 and 1943 (neither of which is published here for reasons of length). This edition, entitled *Problems of the European Federation* bears the initials of the authors, A.S. and E.R., and was edited by Eugenio Colomi who also wrote a very acute preface (for obvious reasons his name does not appear together with Rossi's and Spinelli's). The present text was edited by the *Società Anonima Poligrafica Italiana* and presented by the *Edizioni del Movimento Italiano per la Federazione Europea* (i.e. Publications of the Italian Movement for the European Federation). This edition is based on the 1944 edition which Spinelli stated was "the authentic and precise text".

In addition, two *Appendices* are published. The first gives the *Political Theses* relating to the foundation of the European Federalist Movement, with a view to showing the continuity between the prospects for action contained in the Manifesto and the birth

of the first federalist-type organization of the Resistance Movement. The MFE was in fact founded in Milan on August 27th and 28th 1943 in the course of a clandestine meeting in which just over twenty people took part. The resolutions approved on that occasion were published in the third issue of *L'Unità Europea*, published at the beginning of September 1943. They were translated into German and distributed in the autumn of the same year and published in French in the first edition of *Cahiers de la Fédération Européenne* by the *Comité Français pour la Fédération Européenne* in Paris in February 1945.

The second *Appendix* contains an interview that Altiero Spinelli had with Sonia Schmidt in 1981 which is particularly revealing as regards the genesis of the Manifesto and which helps to explain the action of the founders of the Movement until 1947.

The current text was translated by Anthony Baldry M.A. (Cantab).

## Preface

The present writings were conceived and edited on the island of Ventotene in 1941 and 1942. In that exceptional environment, in the snares of a very rigid discipline, where a thousand subterfuges had to be used to make our information as complete as possible and against a background of sadness at our forced inertia and anxiety over the prospect of imminent liberation, a process of rethinking the entire set of issues that had lain behind the action taken and the attitudes adopted in our struggle was maturing in the minds of various people.

Being so cut off from concrete political life, we could look on matters in a more detached way, and this encouraged us to review traditional positions, seeking out the causes for past failures not so much in terms of errors in parliamentary or revolutionary tactics, or in any general "immaturity" of the circumstances, but rather in the inadequate general approach, paying insufficient attention to the new circumstances changing the world about us and in the commitment to political struggle along the customary lines of division.

As we prepared ourselves for the great battle which was in the offing, we felt the need not simply to correct the errors of the past, but to rethink the very terms of political problems, with minds free from doctrinaire preconceptions or party political myths.

Thus it was that in the minds of various people the central idea was forged that the basic contradiction which causes crises, wars, poverty, and the exploitation that afflicts society is the existence of sovereign States which exist geographically, economically and

militarily, which consider other States as competitors and potential enemies and which live in a perpetual state of *bellum omnium contra omnes* with respect to each other.

The reasons why this idea, *per se* not new, was seen as such a novelty when considered in these special circumstances are many and diverse:

1) First of all, the internationalist solution, which figures in all progressive political parties' manifestoes, is considered by these parties as being in a certain sense, a necessary and almost automatic consequence of the achievement of the ends which each of the parties proposes. Democrats argue that the creation, within each country, of the regime they favour would certainly lead to the formation of that unitary awareness which, by transcending frontiers in cultural and moral fields, would, they argue, be an indispensable premise for the free union of peoples in political and economic fields, too. And the socialists, in their turn, think that the creation of regimes based on the dictatorship of the proletariat in the various States would *per se* lead to an international collectivist State.

Yet an analysis of the modern concept of State and the interests and feelings that go with it, clearly shows that, even though similarities between regimes may facilitate friendly relationships and collaboration between one State and another, it is far from certain that they will lead automatically and progressively to unification — at least for as long as there are collective interests and feelings linked to the maintenance of a unity confined within each nation's frontiers. We know through experience that chauvinist feelings and protectionist interests can easily lead to clashes and rivalry between two democracies. Nor is it the case that a rich socialist State will necessarily agree to pool its resources with a much poorer socialist State, simply because the regime is similar in nature to its own.

Thus the abolition of political and economic frontiers between one State and another does not necessarily derive from the creation of a given regime within each State, a problem in itself, which should be tackled with its own appropriate means. It is not possible

to be a socialist, it is true, without being an internationalist at the same time; but this is true on ideological grounds and is not a political or economic necessity, since the victory of socialists in every individual State does not necessarily give rise to an international State.

2) What, moreover, urged us to stress the federalist thesis in an autonomous way was the fact that, when tackling political problems, the existing political parties, with their history of struggles fought within each nation, tacitly assume by custom and tradition that the national State must perforce exist. They thus consider problems of international order as questions of "foreign policy" to be resolved by means of diplomatic activity and agreements between various governments. This attitude is partly the cause and partly the result of the idea hinted at above, whereby, once power has been gained in one's own country, agreement and union with regimes like one's own in other countries are supposed to be something which is automatic, something not requiring any political struggle expressly dedicated to this end.

But the authors of these papers had the deep-rooted conviction that anyone taking the problem of the international order as the central problem in this historical age and considering its solution to be the prerequisite for solving all the institutional, economic and social problems imposed on our society, is obliged to consider all the issues relating to internal political contrasts and the attitudes of each political party from this point of view, even with regard to the tactics and strategies of daily struggle. All these issues — from constitutional rights to class struggle, from planning to gaining power and using it — take on a very different light when the primary goal is a united international system. Political manoeuvring itself — the support of one or other of the forces on the field, the stressing of one or other political slogan — becomes a very different matter according to whether we consider the essential goal to be the acquisition of power and implementing specific reforms in every individual State or the creation of the economic, political and moral premises for the foundation of a federal system which embraces the entire continent.



3) Another reason, and perhaps the most important one, was the fact that while the ideal of a European Federation, a prelude to a world federation, might have been considered a distant utopia a few years ago, it would now seem to be an achievable goal, almost within our reach. The total reshuffling of peoples that this war has provoked in all the countries who have suffered the German invasion, the need to reconstruct an almost totally destroyed economy on new bases and to tackle all the problems relating to political boundaries, customs barriers, ethnic minorities etc., the very character of this war, in which the national element was so often overshadowed by the ideological element, in which small and average size States have been forced to give up most of their sovereignty in favour of stronger States and where the Fascists have replaced the concept of "living space" with the concept of "national independence" should all be seen as matters which make the issue of a federal organization of Europe even more topical than ever before, in the postwar period.

Forces from all social classes, whether for economic or ideal reasons, will be interested in this. We may move towards this new order by means of diplomatic dealings and popular action, by promoting studies of the issues it involves among the cultured classes, by provoking a *de facto* state of revolution which once fully achieved will make any return to the previous circumstances impossible. We can also move towards it by influencing the managerial classes of the conquering nations and by spreading the word in the defeated States that only in a free and united Europe will they find their salvation and free themselves from the disastrous consequences of defeat.

It is precisely for this end that our Movement arose. The pre-eminence, the anterior nature of this problem vis-à-vis all others affecting our historical period, the certain knowledge that, if the situation is left to gel in the old nationalistic moulds, the opportunity will be lost for ever, and no lasting peace and well-being will be possible in our continent, are all factors which have led us to create an autonomous organization, with a view to proposing the idea of the European Federation as a goal which can be achieved in the immediate postwar period.

We should not blind ourselves to the difficulties and the power of the forces which operate in the opposite direction. But this is the first time we believe that this problem has become a reality of political struggle, not a distant ideal but as a pressing, tragic necessity.

Our Movement, which has existed now for two difficult years in clandestine existence under Fascist and Nazi oppression, with its members who come from the rank and file of anti-Fascist activists, who all agree with the armed struggle for freedom, and who have already paid a heavy price in prison for the common cause, is not, and does not intend to be, a political party. Thus an increasingly characteristic feature of the Movement is its desire to operate on various political parties and within them, not just to highlight the internationalist case but rather to urge that all problems of political life be tackled from this new outlook, which people have so far been unaccustomed to following.

We are not a political party because, although we actively promote all kinds of studies regarding the institutional, economic and social system of the European Federation and although we take an active role in the struggle for its realization, being concerned to discover what forces will favour it in the future economic and political system, we do not wish to pronounce ourselves officially on the institutional details, on the greater or lesser degree of economic collectivization, on the greater or lesser administrative decentralization etc. etc. characterizing the future federal body. Ample space is left in our movement for full discussion of these problems and the entire political spectrum, from Communist to Liberal trends, is represented among us. In fact, almost all our members are active in some of the progressive parties: all agree in proposing the basic principles of a free European Federation, not based on any kind of hegemony, nor on totalitarian systems, but with such structural soundness that it is not reduced merely to being a simple League of Nations. These principles can be summarized in the following way: a single federal army, monetary union, abolition of customs barriers and restrictions on emigration between States belonging to the Federation, direct representation of citizens on federal assemblies, one foreign policy.

In these two years of its life, our Movement has expanded widely among anti-Fascist groups and parties. Some of them have publicly expressed their adherence and their sympathy. Others have asked us to collaborate with their political programmes. It is perhaps not too presumptuous to say that it is in part our merit, if the problems of the European Federation are so often dealt with in this way in the clandestine Italian press. Our journal *L'Unità Europea* closely follows the events of internal and international politics, taking up a position whose hallmark is absolute independence of judgement.

The present writings, the result of the working out of the ideas which gave rise to our Movement, are only the opinion of their authors and not a statement of the Movement's position. They are merely intended to be a suggestion as regards what matters should be debated by those who wish to rethink all the problems of international political life bearing in mind the most recent ideological and political experiences, the most updated results of economic science, the most sensible and reasonable prospects for the future. They will soon be followed by other studies. Our hope is that they may raise a ferment of ideas and that, in the present atmosphere made incandescent by the impelling need for action, they will lead to a contribution that clarifies and makes the action increasingly decisive, politically aware and responsible.

THE ITALIAN MOVEMENT  
FOR EUROPEAN FEDERATION

Rome, January 22nd 1944

## **Towards a Free and United Europe**

### **A Draft Manifesto**

## **I. The Crisis of Modern Civilization**

Modern civilization has taken the principle of freedom as its basis, a principle which holds that man must not be a mere instrument to be used by others but an autonomous centre of life. With this code at hand, all those aspects of society that have not respected this principle have been placed on trial, a great historical trial.

1) The equal right of all nations to organize themselves into independent States has been established. Every people, defined by its ethnic, geographical, linguistic and historical characteristics, was expected to find the instrument best suited to its needs within a State organization created according to its own specific concept of political life, and with no outside intervention. The ideology of national independence was a powerful stimulus to progress. It helped overcome narrow-minded parochialism and created a much wider feeling of solidarity against foreign oppression. It eliminated many obstacles hindering the free movement of people and goods. Within the territory of each new State, it brought the institutions and systems of the more advanced societies to more backward ones. But with this ideology came the seeds of capitalist imperialism which our own generation has seen mushroom to the point where totalitarian States have grown up and world wars have been unleashed.

Thus the nation is no longer viewed as the historical product of co-existence between men who, as the result of a lengthy historical process, have acquired greater unity in their customs and aspira-

tions and who see their State as being the most effective means of organizing collective life within the context of all human society. Rather the nation has become a divine entity, an organism which must only consider its own existence, its own development, without the least regard for the damage that others may suffer from this. The absolute sovereignty of national States has led to the desire of each of them to dominate, since each feels threatened by the strength of the others, and considers that its "living space" should include increasingly vast territories that give it the right to free movement and that provide self-sustenance without needing to rely on others. This desire to dominate cannot be placated except by the hegemony of the strongest State over all the others.

As a consequence of this, from being the guardian of citizens' freedom, the State has been turned into a master of vassals bound into servitude, and has all the powers it needs to achieve the maximum war efficiency. Even during peacetime, considered to be pauses during which to prepare for subsequent, inevitable wars, the will of the military class now holds sway over the will of the civilian class in many countries, making it increasingly difficult to operate free political systems. Schools, science, production, administrative bodies are mainly directed towards increasing military strength. Women are considered merely as producers of soldiers and are rewarded with the same criteria as prolific cattle. From the very earliest age, children are taught to handle weapons and hate foreigners. Individual freedom is reduced to nothing since everyone is part of the military establishment and constantly called on to serve in the armed forces. Repeated wars force men to abandon families, jobs, property, and even lay down their lives for goals, the value of which no-one really understands. It takes just a few days to destroy the results of decades of common effort to increase the general well-being.

Totalitarian States are precisely those which have unified all their forces in the most coherent way, by implementing the greatest possible degree of centralization and autarky. They have thus shown themselves to be the bodies most suited to the current international environment. It only needs one nation to take one step towards more accentuated totalitarianism for the others to

follow suit, dragged down in the same rut by their will to survive.

2) The equal right of all citizens to participate in the process of determining the State's will is well established. This process should have been the synthesis of the freely expressed and changing economic and ideological needs of all social classes. A political organization of this kind made it possible to correct or at least to minimize many of the most strident injustices inherited from previous regimes. But freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and the steady extension of suffrage, made it increasingly difficult to defend old privileges, while maintaining a representative system of government.

Bit by bit the penniless learned to use these instruments to fight for the rights acquired by the privileged classes. Taxes on unearned income and inheritances, higher taxes levied on larger incomes, tax exemptions for low incomes and essential goods, free public schooling, greater social security spending, land reforms, inspection of factories and manufacturing plants were all achievements that threatened the privileged classes in their well-fortified citadels.

Even the privileged classes who agreed with equality in political rights, could not accept the fact that the underprivileged could use it to achieve a *de facto* equality that would have created a very real freedom with a very concrete content. When the threat became all too serious at the end of the First World War, it was only natural that these privileged classes should have warmly welcomed and supported the rise of dictatorships that removed their adversaries' legislative weapons.

Moreover, the creation of huge industrial, banking conglomerates and trades unions representing whole armies of workers gave rise to forces (unions, employers and financiers) lobbying the government to give them the policies which most clearly favoured their particular interests. This threatened to dissolve the State into countless economic fiefdoms, each bitterly opposed to the others. Liberal and democratic systems increasingly lost their prestige by becoming the tools that these groups always resort to in order to exploit all of society even more. In this way, the conviction grew

up that only a totalitarian State, in which individual rights were abolished, could somehow resolve the conflicts of interest that existing political institutions were unable to control.

Subsequently, in fact, totalitarian regimes consolidated the position of the various social categories at the levels they had gradually achieved. By using the police to control every aspect of each citizen's life, and by violently silencing all dissenting voices, these regimes barred all legal possibility of further correction in the state of affairs. This consolidated the existence of a thoroughly parasitic class of absentee landowners and *rentiers* who contribute to social productivity only by cutting the coupons off their bonds. It consolidated the position of monopoly holders and the chain stores who exploit the consumers and cause small savers' money to vanish. It consolidated the plutocrats hidden behind the scenes who pull the politicians' strings and run the State machine to their own, exclusive advantage, under the guise of higher national interests. The colossal fortunes of a very few people have been preserved, as has the poverty of the masses, excluded from the enjoyment of the fruits of modern culture. In other words an economic regime has substantially been preserved in which material resources and labour, which ought to be directed to the satisfaction of fundamental needs for the development of essential human energies, are instead channelled towards the satisfaction of the most futile wishes of those capable of paying the highest prices. It is an economic regime in which, through the right of inheritance, the power of money is perpetuated in the same class, and is transformed into a privilege that in no way corresponds to the social value of the services actually rendered. The field of proletarian possibilities is so restricted that workers are often forced to accept exploitation by anyone who offers a job in order to make a living.

In order to keep the working classes immobilized and subjugated, the trade unions, once free organizations of struggle, run by individuals who enjoyed the trust of their members, have been turned into institutions for police surveillance run by employees chosen by the ruling class and responsible only to them. Where improvements are made in this economic regime, they are always

solely dictated by military needs which have merged with the reactionary aspirations of the privileged classes in giving rise to and consolidating totalitarian States.

3) The permanent value of the spirit of criticism has been asserted against authoritarian dogmatism. Everything that is affirmed must prove its worth or disappear. The greatest achievements of human society in every field are due to the scientific method that lies behind this unfettered approach. But this spiritual freedom has not survived the crisis created by totalitarian States. New dogmas to be accepted as articles of faith or simply hypocritically are advancing in all fields of knowledge.

Although nobody knows what a race is, and the most elementary understanding of history brings home the absurdity of the statement, physiologists are asked to believe, demonstrate and even persuade us that people belong to a chosen race, merely because imperialism needs this myth to stir the masses to hate and pride. The most self-evident concepts of economic science have to be treated as anathema so as to enable autarkic policy, trade balances and other old chestnuts of mercantilism to be presented as extraordinary discoveries of our times. Because of the economic interdependence of the entire world, the living space required by any people which wants to maintain a living standard consistent with modern civilization can only be the entire world. But the pseudo-science of geopolitics has been created in an attempt to prove the soundness of theories about living space and to provide a theoretical cloak to the imperialist desire to dominate.

Essential historical facts are falsified, in the interests of the ruling classes. Libraries and bookshops are purged of all works not considered to be orthodox. The shadows of obscurantism once more threaten to suffocate the human spirit. The social ethic of freedom and equality has itself been undermined. Men are no longer considered free citizens who can use the State to achieve collective goals. They are, instead, servants of the State, which decides what their goals must be, and the will of those who hold power becomes the will of the State. Men are no longer subjects with civil rights, but are instead arranged hierarchically and are

expected to obey their superiors without argument, the hierarchy culminating in a suitably deified leader. The regime based on castes is reborn from its own ashes, as bullying as it was before.

After triumphing in a series of countries, this reactionary, totalitarian civilization, has finally found in Nazi Germany the power considered strong enough to take the last step. After meticulous preparation, boldly and unscrupulously exploiting the rivalries, egoism and stupidity of others, dragging in its path other European vassal States, primarily Italy, and allying itself with Japan, which follows the very same goals in Asia, Nazi Germany has launched itself on the task of crushing other countries. Its victory would mean the definitive consolidation of totalitarianism in the world. All its characteristics would be exasperated to the utmost degree, and progressive forces would be condemned for many years to the role of simple negative opposition.

The traditional arrogance and intransigence of the German military classes can give us an idea of the nature of their dominance after victory in war. The victorious Germans might even concede a façade of generosity towards other European peoples, formally respecting their territories and their political institutions, and thus be able to command while at the same time satisfying the false patriotic sentiments of those who count the colour of the flag flying at the country's borders and the nationality of prominent politicians as being the major considerations and who fail to appreciate the significance of power relationships and the real content of the State's institutions. However camouflaged, the reality is always the same: a new division of humanity into Spartans and Helots.

Even a compromise solution between the two warring sides would be one more step forward for totalitarianism. All those countries which managed to escape Germany's grasp would be forced to adopt the very same forms of political organization to be adequately prepared for the continuation of hostilities.

But the very fact that Hitler's Germany has managed to chop down the smaller States one by one, has forced increasingly powerful forces to join battle. The courageous fighting spirit of Great Britain, even at that most critical moment when it was left

to face the enemy alone, meant that the Germans came up against the brave resistance of the Russian Army, and gave America the time it needed to mobilize its endless productive resources. This struggle against German imperialism is closely linked to the Chinese people's struggles against Japanese imperialism.

Huge masses of men and wealth are already drawn up against totalitarian powers whose strength has already reached its peak and can now only gradually consume itself. The forces that oppose them have, on the other hand, already survived the worst and their strength is increasing.

With every day that passes, the war the allies are fighting rekindles the yearning for freedom, even in those countries which were subjected to violence and who lost their way as result of the blow they received. It has even rekindled this yearning among the peoples in the Axis countries who realize they have been dragged down into a desperate situation, simply to satisfy their rulers' lust for power.

The slow process which led huge masses of men to be meekly shaped by the new regime, who adjusted to it and even contributed to its consolidation, has been halted and the reverse process has started. All the progressive forces can be found in this huge wave which is slowly gathering momentum: the most enlightened groups of the working classes who have not let themselves be swayed, either by terror or by flattery, from their ambition to achieve a better standard of living; the sharpest members of the intellectual classes, offended by the degradation to which intelligence is subjected; entrepreneurs who, wanting to undertake new initiatives, want to free themselves of the trappings of bureaucracy and national autarky, that bog down all their efforts; and, finally, all those who, with an innate sense of dignity, will not bend one inch when faced with the humiliation of servitude.

Today, the salvation of our civilization is entrusted to these forces.

## II. Postwar Tasks. European Unity

Germany's defeat would not automatically lead to the reorganization of Europe in accordance with our ideal of civilization.

In the brief, intense period of general crisis (when the States will lie broken, when the masses will be anxiously waiting for a new message, like molten matter, burning, and easily shaped into new moulds capable of accommodating the guidance of serious internationalist-minded men), the most privileged classes in the old national systems will attempt, by underhand or violent methods, to dampen the wave of internationalist feelings and passions and will ostentatiously begin to reconstruct the old State institutions. Most probably, the British leaders, perhaps in agreement with the Americans, will try to push things in this direction, in order to restore balance-of-power politics, in the apparent immediate interests of their empires.

All the reactionary forces can feel the house is creaking around them and are now trying to save their skins: the conservative forces; the administrators of the major institutions of the nation States; the top-ranking officers in the armed forces including, where they still exist, the monarchies; the monopoly capitalist groups whose profits are linked to the fortunes of States; the big landowners and the ecclesiastical hierarchy, whose parasitical income is only guaranteed in a stable, conservative society; and, in their wake, the countless band of people who depend on them or who are simply blinded by their traditional power. If the house were to collapse, they would suddenly be deprived of all the privileges they have enjoyed up to now, and would be exposed to

the assault of the progressive forces.

*The Revolutionary Situation: Old and New Trends.*

The fall of the totalitarian regimes will, in the feelings of entire populations, mean the coming of "freedom"; all restrictions will disappear and, automatically, very wide freedom of speech and assembly will reign supreme. It will be the triumph of democratic beliefs. These tendencies have countless shades and nuances, stretching from very conservative liberalism to socialism and anarchy. These beliefs place their trust in the "spontaneous generation" of events and institutions and the absolute goodness of drives originating among the grass roots. They do not want to force the hand of "history", or "the people", or "the proletariat", or whatever other name they give their God. They hope for the end of dictatorships, conceiving this as restoring the people's unsuppressible right to self-determination. Their crowning dream is a constituent assembly, elected by the broadest suffrage, which scrupulously respects the rights of the electors, who must decide upon the constitution they want. If the population is immature, the constitution will not be a good one, but to amend it will be possible only through constant efforts of persuasion.

Democrats do not refrain from violence on principle but wish to use it only when the majority is convinced it is indispensable, little more, that is, than an almost superfluous "dot" over an "i". They are suitable leaders only in times of ordinary administration, when the overall population is convinced of the validity of the basic institutions and believe that any amendment should be restricted to relatively secondary matters. During revolutionary times, when institutions are not simply to be administered but created, democratic procedures fail miserably. The pitiful impotence of democrats in the Russian, German, Spanish revolutions are the three most recent examples. In these situations, once the old State apparatus has fallen away, along with its laws and its administration, popular assemblies and delegations immediately spring up in which all the progressive socialist forces converge and agitate, either hiding behind the *ancien régime*, or scorning it.

The population does have some fundamental needs to satisfy, but it does not know precisely what it wants and what must be done. A thousand bells ring in its ears. With its millions of minds, it cannot orientate itself, and breaks up into numerous tendencies, currents and factions, all struggling with one another.

At the very moment when the greatest decisiveness and boldness is needed, democrats lose their way, not having the backing of spontaneous popular approval, but rather a gloomy tumult of passions. They think it their duty to form a consensus and they represent themselves as exhortatory preachers, where instead there is a need for leaders who know just what they want. They miss chances favourable to the consolidation of a new regime by attempting to make bodies, which need longer preparation and which are more suited to periods of relative tranquillity, work immediately. They give their adversaries the weapons they need to overthrow them. In their thousand tendencies, they do not represent a will for renewal, but vain and very confused ambitions found in minds that, by becoming paralyzed, actually prepare the terrain for the growth of reaction. Democratic political methods are a dead weight during revolutionary crises.

As the democrats wear down their initial popularity as assertors of freedom by their endless polemic, and in the absence of any serious political and social revolution, the pre-totalitarian political institutions will inevitably come to be reconstituted, and the struggle will again develop along the lines of the old class opposition.

The principle whereby the class struggle is the condition to which all political problems are reduced, has become the fundamental guideline of factory workers in particular. It gave consistency to their politics for as long as the fundamental institutions were not questioned. But this approach becomes an instrument which isolates the proletariat, when the need to transform the entire social organization becomes paramount. The workers, educated in the class system, cannot see beyond the demands of their particular class or even their professional category and fail to concern themselves with how their interests link up with those of other social classes. Or they aspire to a unilateral dictatorship

of the proletariat in order to achieve the utopistic collectivization of all the material means of production, indicated by centuries of propaganda as the panacea for all evils. This policy attracts no class other than the workers, who thus deprive the other progressive forces of their support, or alternatively leaves them at the mercy of reactionary forces which skilfully organizes them so as to break up the proletarian movement.

Among the various proletarian tendencies, followers of class politics and collectivist ideals, the Communists have recognized the difficulty of obtaining a sufficient following to assure victory so that, unlike the other popular parties, they have turned themselves into a rigidly disciplined movement, exploiting the Russian myth in order to organize the workers, but which accepts no orders from the workers and uses them in all kinds of political manoeuvrings.

This attitude makes the Communists, during revolutionary crises, more efficient than the democrats. But their ability to maintain the workers as far removed from the other revolutionary forces as they can, by preaching that their "real" revolution is yet to come, turns them into a sectarian element that weakens the sum of the progressive forces at the decisive moment. Besides this, their absolute dependence upon the Russian State, which has repeatedly used them in pursuing its national policies, prevents this Party from undertaking political activity with any continuity. They always need to hide behind a Karoly, a Blum, a Negrin, only to fall headlong into ruin together with the democratic puppets they used, since power is achieved and maintained, not simply through cunning but with the ability to respond fully and viably to the needs of modern society.

If tomorrow the struggle were to remain restricted within traditional national boundaries, it would be very difficult to avoid the old contradictions. The nation States, in fact, have so deeply planned their respective economies, that the main question would soon be which group of economic interests, i.e., which class, should be in control of the plan. The progressive front would be quickly shattered in the brawl between economic classes and categories. The most probable result would be that the reactionar-



ies would benefit more than anyone else.

A real revolutionary movement must arise from among those who have been bold enough to criticize the old political approaches and it must be able to collaborate with democratic and with Communist forces; and generally with all those who work for the break-up of totalitarianism, without, however, becoming ensnared by the political practices of any of these.

The reactionary forces have capable men and officers who have been trained to command and who will fight tenaciously to preserve their supremacy. In moments of dire need, they know just how to disguise their true nature, saying they stand by freedom, peace, general well-being and the poorer classes.

Already in the past we have seen how they wormed their way into popular movements, paralyzing, deflecting and altering them into precisely the opposite of what they are. They will certainly be the most dangerous force to be faced.

The point they will seek to exploit is the restoration of the nation State. Thus they will be able to latch on to what is, by far the most widespread of popular feelings, so deeply offended by recent events and so easily manipulated to reactionary ends: patriotic feeling. In this way they can also hope to confound their adversaries' ideas more easily, since for the popular masses, the only political experience acquired to date has been within the national context. It is, therefore, fairly easy to channel them and their more shortsighted leaders towards the reconstruction of the States destroyed in the storm.

If this end is achieved, the forces of reaction will have won. In appearance, these States might well be democratic and socialist on a large scale. But it would only be a question of time before power fell into the hands of the reactionaries. National jealousies would be revived, and State would again seek to fulfil its requirements in its armed strength. In a more or less brief space of time the most important duty would be to convert populations into armies. Generals would again command, the monopoly holders would again draw profits from autarkies, the bureaucracy would continue to swell, the priests would keep the masses docile. All the initial achievements would shrivel into nothing, faced with the

need to prepare for war once more.

The question which must be resolved first, failing which progress is no more than mere appearance, is the definitive abolition of the division of Europe into national, sovereign States. The collapse of the majority of the States on the Continent under the German steam-roller has already given the people of Europe a common destiny: either they will all submit to Hitler's dominion, or, after his fall, they will all enter a revolutionary crisis and thus will not find themselves separated by, and entrenched in, solid State structures. Feelings today are already far more disposed than they were in the past to accept a federal reorganization of Europe. The harsh experience of recent decades has opened the eyes even of those who refused to see, and has matured many circumstances favourable to our ideal.

All reasonable men recognize that it is impossible to maintain a balance of power among European States with militarist Germany enjoying equal conditions with other countries, nor can Germany be broken up into pieces or held on a chain once it is conquered. We have seen a demonstration that no country within Europe can stay on the sidelines while the others battle: declarations of neutrality and non-aggression pacts come to nought. The uselessness, even harmfulness, of organizations like the League of Nations has been demonstrated: they claimed to guarantee international law without a military force capable of imposing their decisions and by respecting the absolute sovereignty of the member States. The principle of non intervention turned out to be absurd: every population was supposed to be left free to choose the despotic government it thought best, in other words virtually assuming that the constitution of each individual States was not a question of vital interest for all the other European nations. The multiple problems which poison international life on the continent have proved insoluble: tracing boundaries through areas inhabited by mixed populations, defence of alien minorities, seaports for landlocked countries, the Balkan Question, the Irish problem, and so on. All matters which would find easy solutions in the European Federation, just as corresponding problems, suffered by the small States which became part of a vaster national unity, lost their

harshness as they were turned into problems of relationships between various provinces.

Moreover, the end of the sense of security inspired and created by an unassailable Great Britain, which led Britain to "splendid isolation", the dissolution of the French army and the disintegration of the French Republic itself at the first serious collision with the German forces (which, it is to be hoped, will have lessened the chauvinistic attitude of absolute Gallic superiority), and in particular the awareness of the risk of total enslavement are all circumstances that will favour the constitution of a federal regime, which will bring an end to the current anarchy. Furthermore, it is easier to find a basis of agreement for a European arrangement of colonial possessions since Britain has accepted the principle of India's independence and since France has potentially lost its entire empire in recognizing its defeat.

To all of this must be added the disappearance of some of the most important dynasties, and the fragility of the basis which sustains the ones that survive. It must be taken into account that these dynasties, by considering the various countries as their own traditional appanage, together with the powerful interests backing them, represented a serious obstacle to the rational organization of the United States of Europe, which can only be based on the republican constitution of federated countries. And, once the horizon of the old Continent is superseded, and all the peoples who make up mankind are included in a single design, it will have to be recognized that the European Federation is the only conceivable guarantee ensuring that relationships with American and Asiatic peoples will work on the basis of peaceful co-operation, waiting for a more distant future when the political unity of the entire world will become possible.

Therefore, the dividing line between progressive and reactionary parties no longer coincides with the formal lines of more or less democracy, or the pursuit of more or less socialism, but the division falls along a very new and substantial line: those who conceive the essential purpose and goal of struggle as being the ancient one, the conquest of national political power, and who, albeit involuntarily, play into the hands of reactionary forces,

letting the incandescent lava of popular passions set in the old moulds, and thus allowing old absurdities to arise once again, and those who see the main purpose as the creation of a solid international State, who will direct popular forces towards this goal, and who, even if they were to win national power, would use it first and foremost as an instrument for achieving international unity.

By means of propaganda and action, seeking to establish in every possible way agreements and links between the individual movements which are certainly in the process of being formed in the various countries, the foundations must be built now for a movement that knows how to mobilize all forces for the birth of the new body which will be the grandest creation, and the newest, that has occurred in Europe for centuries; that will constitute a steady federal State, with a European army at its disposal instead of national armies; that will break decisively economic autarkies, the backbone of totalitarian regimes; that will have sufficient means to see that its decisions for the maintenance of common order are executed in the individual federal States, while each State will retain the autonomy it needs for a plastic articulation and development of political life according to the particular characteristics of the various peoples.

If a sufficient number of men in the main European countries understand this, then victory will soon fall into their hands, since both circumstances and opinion will be favourable to their efforts. They will have before them parties and factions that have already been disqualified by the disastrous experience of the last twenty years. Since it will be the moment for new action, it will also be the moment for new men: the MOVEMENT FOR A FREE AND UNITED EUROPE.

### III. Postwar Duties. Reform of Society

A free and united Europe is the necessary premise to the strengthening of modern civilization with regard to which the totalitarian era is only a temporary setback. As soon as this era ends the historical process of struggle against social inequalities and privileges will be restored in full. All the old conservative institutions that have hindered this process will either have collapsed or will be teetering on the verge of collapse. The crisis in these institutions must be boldly and decisively exploited.

In order to respond to our needs, the European revolution must be socialist, i.e. its goal must be the emancipation of the working classes and the creation of more humane conditions for them. The guiding light in determining what steps need to be taken, however, cannot simply be the utterly doctrinaire principle whereby private ownership of the material means of production must in principle be abolished and only temporarily tolerated when dispensing with it entirely. Wholesale nationalization of the economy under State control was the first, utopian form taken by the working classes' concept of their freedom from the yoke of capitalism. But when this State control is achieved, it does not produce the desired results but leads to a regime where the entire population is subservient to a restricted class of bureaucrats who run the economy.

The truly fundamental principle of socialism, vis-à-vis which general collectivization was no more than a hurried and erroneous inference, is the principle which states that, far from dominating man, economic forces, like the forces of nature, should be subject

to man, guided and controlled by him in the most rational way, so that the broadest strata of the population will not become their victims. The huge forces of progress that spring from individual interests, must not be extinguished by the grey dullness of routine. Otherwise, the same insoluble problem will arise: how to stimulate the spirit of initiative using salary differentials and other provisions of the same kind. The forces of progress must be extolled and extended, by giving them increasing opportunities for development and employment. At the same time, the tracks guiding these forces towards objectives of greatest benefit for all society must be strengthened and perfected.

Private property must be abolished, limited, corrected, or extended according to the circumstances and not according to any dogmatic principle. This guiding principle is a natural feature in the process of forming a European economic life freed from the nightmares of militarism or national bureaucratism. Rational solutions must replace irrational ones, even in the working class consciousness. With a view to indicating the content of this principle in greater detail, we emphasize the following points while stressing the need to assess the appropriateness of every point in the programme and the means of achieving them in relation to the indispensable premise of European unity:

a) Enterprises with a necessarily monopolistic activity, and in a position to exploit consumers, cannot be left in the hands of private ownership: for example, electricity companies or industries of vital interest to the community which require protective duties, subsidies, preferential orders etc. if they are to survive (the most visible example of this kind of industry so far in Italy is the steel industry); and enterprises which, owing to the amount of capital invested, the number of workers employed, and the significance of the sector involved can blackmail various State bodies, forcing them to adopt the policies most beneficial to themselves (for example, the mining industries, large banks, large weapons manufacturers). In this field, nationalization must certainly be introduced on a vast scale, without regard for acquired rights.

b) Private property and inheritance legislation in the past was so drawn up as to permit the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, privileged members of society. In a revolutionary crisis this wealth must be distributed in an egalitarian way thereby eliminating the parasitic classes and giving the workers the means of production they need to improve their economic standing and to achieve greater independence. We are thus proposing an agrarian reform which will increase the number of owners enormously by giving land to those who actually farm it and an industrial reform which will extend workers' ownership in non-nationalized sectors, through co-operative adventures, employee profit-sharing, and so on.

c) The young need to be assisted with all the measures needed to reduce the gap between the starting positions in the struggle to survive to a minimum. In particular, State schools ought to provide a real chance for the deserving to continue their studies to the highest level, instead of restricting these opportunities to wealthy students. In each branch of study leading to training in different crafts and the various liberal and scientific professions, State schools should train the number of students which corresponds to the market requirements, so that average salaries will be roughly equal for all the professional categories, regardless of the differing rates of remuneration within each category according to individual skills.

d) The almost unlimited potentials of modern technology to mass produce essential goods guarantees, with relatively low social costs, that everyone can have food, lodging, clothing and the minimum of comfort needed to preserve a sense of human dignity. Human solidarity towards those who fall in the economic struggle ought not, therefore, to be manifested with humiliating forms of charity that produce the very same evils they seek to remedy but ought to consist in a series of measures which unconditionally, and regardless of whether a person is able to work or not, guarantee a decent standard of living for all without lessening the stimulus to work and save. In this way, no-one will

be forced any longer to accept enslaving work contracts because of their poverty.

e) Working-class freedom can only be achieved when the conditions described have been fulfilled. The working classes must not be left to the mercy of the economic policies of monopolistic trade unions who simply apply the overpowering methods characteristic, above all, of great capital to the shopfloor. The workers must once again be free to choose their own trusted representatives when collectively establishing the conditions under which they will agree to work, and the State must give them the legal means to guarantee the proper implementation of the terms agreed to. But all monopolistic tendencies can be fought effectively once these social changes have been fulfilled.

These are the changes needed both to create very broad-based support around the new institutional system from a large number of citizens willing to defend its survival and to stamp freedom and a strong sense of social solidarity onto political life in a very marked way. Political freedom with these foundations will not just have a formal meaning but a real meaning for all since citizens will be independent, and will be sufficiently informed as to be able to exert continuous and effective control over the ruling class.

It would be superfluous to dwell at length on constitutional institutions, not knowing at this stage, or being able to foresee, the circumstances under which they will be drawn up and will have to operate. We can do no more than repeat what everyone knows regarding the need for representative bodies, the process of developing legislation, the independence of the courts (which will replace the present system) safeguarding impartial application of legislation and the freedom of the press and right of assembly guaranteeing informed public opinion and the possibility for all citizens to participate effectively in the State's life. Only two issues require further and deeper definition because of their particular significance for our country at this moment: the relationship between Church and State and the nature of political representation.

a) The Treaty which concluded the Vatican's alliance with Fascism in Italy must be abolished so that the purely lay character of the State can be asserted and so that the supremacy of the State in civil matters can be unequivocally established. All religious faiths are to be equally respected, but the State must no longer have to earmark funds for religion.

b) The house of cards that Fascism built with its corporativism will collapse together with the other aspects of the totalitarian State. There are those who believe that material for the new constitutional order can be salvaged from this wreck. We disagree. In totalitarian States, the corporative chambers are the crowning hoax of police control over the workers. Even if the corporative chambers were a sincere expression of the will of the various categories of producers, the representative bodies of the various professional categories could never be qualified to handle questions of general policy. In more specifically economic matters, they would become bodies for the accumulation of power and privilege among the categories with the strongest trade union representation. The unions would have broad collaborative functions with State bodies which are appointed to resolve problems directly involving these unions, but they should have absolutely no legislative power, since this would create a kind of feudal anarchy in the economic life of the country, leading to renewed political despotism. Many of those who were ingenuously attracted by the myth of corporativism, can and should be attracted by the task of renewing structures. But they must realize the absurdity of the solution they vaguely desire. Corporativism can only be concretely expressed in the form it was given by totalitarian States regimenting the workers beneath officials who monitored everything they did in the interests of the ruling class.

The revolutionary party cannot be amateurishly improvised at the decisive moment, but must begin to be formed at least as regards its central political attitude, its upper echelons, the basic directives for action. It must not be a heterogeneous mass of tendencies, united merely negatively and temporarily, i.e. united

by their anti-Fascist past and the mere expectation of the fall of the totalitarian regime, in which all and sundry are ready to go their own separate ways once this goal has been reached. The revolutionary party, on the contrary, knows that only at this stage will its real work begin. It must therefore be made up of men who agree on the main issues for the future.

Its methodical propaganda must penetrate everywhere there are people oppressed by the present regime. Taking as its starting point the problem which is the source of greatest suffering to individuals and classes, it must show how this problem is linked to other problems, and what the real solution will be. But from this gradually increasing circle of sympathizers, it must pick out and recruit into the organization only those who have identified and accepted the European revolution as the main goal in their lives, who carry out the necessary work with strict discipline day in day out, carefully checking up on its continuous and effective safety, even in the most dangerously illegal situations. These recruits will be the solid network that will give consistency to the more ephemeral sphere of the sympathizers.

While overlooking no occasion or sector in which to spread its cause, it must be active first and foremost in those environments which are most significant as centres for the circulation of ideas and recruiting of combative men. It must be particularly active vis-à-vis the working class and intellectuals, the two social groups most sensitive, in the present situation, and most decisive for tomorrow's world. The first group is the one which least gave in to the totalitarian rod and which will be the quickest to reorganize its ranks. The intellectuals, particularly the younger intellectuals, are the group which feels most spiritually suffocated and disgusted with the current despotism. Bit by bit other social groups will be drawn into the general movement.

Any movement which fails in its duty to ally these forces, is condemned to sterility. Because if the movement is made up of intellectuals alone, it will lack the strength to crush reactionary resistance, and it will distrust and be distrusted by the working class and even though inspired by democratic sentiment, when faced with difficulties it will be liable to shift its position, as

regards the mobilization of other classes against the workers, and thus restoring Fascism. If, instead, the movement is backed only by the proletariat, it will be deprived of the clarity of thought which only intellectuals can give and which is so vital in identifying new paths and new duties: the movement would be a prisoner of the old class structure, looking on everyone as a potential enemy, and would slither towards the doctrinaire Communist solution.

During the revolutionary crisis, this movement will have the task of organizing and guiding progressive forces, using all the popular bodies which form spontaneously, incandescent melting pots in which the revolutionary masses are mixed, not for the creation of plebiscites, but rather waiting to be guided. It derives its vision and certainty of what must be done from the knowledge that it represents the deepest needs of modern society and not from any previous recognition by popular will, as yet inexistent. In this way it issues the basic guidelines of the new order, the first social discipline directed to the unformed masses. By this dictatorship of the revolutionary party a new State will be formed, and around this State new, genuine democracy will grow.

There are no grounds for fearing that such a revolutionary regime will develop into renewed despotism. This arises only when the tendency has been to shape a servile society. But if the revolutionary party continues resolutely from the very outset to create the conditions required for individual freedom whereby every citizen can really participate in the State's life, it will evolve, despite secondary political crises, towards increasing understanding and acceptance of the new order by all — hence towards an increasing possibility of working effectively and creating free political institutions.

The time has now come to get rid of these old cumbersome burdens and to be ready for whatever turns up, usually so different from what was expected, to get rid of the inept among the old and create new energies among the young. Today, in an effort to begin shaping the outlines of the future, those who have understood the reasons for the current crisis in European civilization, and who have therefore inherited the ideals of movements dedicated to raising the dignity of mankind, which were shipwrecked either on

their inability to understand the goal to be pursued or on the means by which to achieve it have begun to meet and seek each other out.

The road to pursue is neither easy nor certain. But it must be followed and it will be!

## **Appendices**

## **The Foundation of the MFE\* Political Thesis**

I. The collapse of the Italian Fascist Government does not mean that Fascism has been destroyed. It is still there concealed by the monarchy and the military dictatorship; and above all the most dangerous Fascist imperialism still exists: the imperialism of Hitler. Therefore it is the primary duty of all Italians in the present situation to demand:

- a) The complete destruction of all remaining traces of Fascism under whatever guise they may masquerade;
- b) The creation of a government consisting of individuals and parties who provide a secure guarantee that they will fight Fascism wherever and in whatever form it appears;
- c) The immediate conclusion of peace through the United Nations;
- d) Active participation in the war against Nazism until it is completely destroyed, and a readiness to use every means at the disposal of the Italian people to that end;
- e) Active participation in the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

II. If a postwar order is established in which each State retains its complete national sovereignty, the basis for a Third World War would still exist even after the Nazi attempt to establish the domination of the German race in Europe has been frustrated.

---

(\*) - The MFE (*Movimento Federalista Europeo*) was founded in Milan on August 27th and 28th 1943.



Nations must no longer possess the right to make war and conclude peace; to have national armies under their control; to divide up the world into exclusive economic units with the aim of depriving their rival countries of markets and raw materials, thus securing a monopoly position for their own benefit; to deprive people of the freedom to go where they like by preventing them from settling in districts where their activity gives them self-satisfaction and is also beneficial to mankind as a whole; to transform themselves undisturbed into despotic States who educate their citizens to hate and resort to force and make preparations for aggression. All these powers provide instruments of destruction, barbarism and suppression.

III. Equally fatal would be a solution after the pattern of the League of Nations or the German *Staatenbund* (League of States) of the last century. Such a League of sovereign States which has no armed force of its own but is dependent upon the armed forces of the member States would be a politically inadequate instrument to look after the common interests of the Continent. Such an organization could only serve as a medium for powerful States to assert their hegemony, and it would become the breeding ground for new imperialistic conflicts.

IV. Militarism, despotism and wars can be abolished only through the creation of a European Federation to which those sovereign rights are transferred which concern the interests of all Europeans: rights which today in the hands of national States bring about death and destruction. Armaments, international trade, the fixing of national frontiers, the administration of colonial territories not yet ripe for self-government, safeguards against the re-establishment of authoritarian regimes — in short, the administration of peace and freedom throughout the whole of Europe must be subject to the legislative, executive and judicial authority of the European Federation. Within the territory covered by the sovereign Federation, the citizens of the various States must enjoy European citizenship as well as their national citizenship; e.g. they must have the right to elect and control the federal government,

and they must be directly subject to the laws of the Federation.

V. The MFE does not seek to be an alternative to political movements which strive for national independence, political freedom, economic justice. It does not tell the leaders and supporters of those movements which in a way concern themselves with everything in our culture that is alive and progressive — national independence, freedom, socialism — that these are ideals they must abandon in order to devote themselves exclusively to the unification of Europe. On the contrary, it is from these movements that the MFE draws its support and it works to establish those aims which represent the highest values of our civilization. But whereas patriots, democrats and socialists commonly think that they must first achieve these aims in the individual countries and assume that ultimately, and automatically as it were, an international situation would arise in which all peoples would fraternize, the MFE warns against this illusion. The order of importance of these aims is just the other way round. National independence, freedom, socialism will come alive and will exist as beneficial forces only when Federation, i. e. a political institution which safeguards international peace and justice, is their basis and not their consequence. If we succeed in laying the foundations of a European Federation, the realization of all other progressive aims will be easier. If we concern ourselves exclusively with the internal problems of the various nations, national, political and social, the causes of rivalry, conflicts, imperialism, militarism, despotism and wars will all remain. National independence would again take the form of national-socialist arrogance seeking to oppress weaker nations; political freedom would be suffocated by militarism and would disappear; and the socialist structure would become a convenient instrument to keep the nation under the arms prepared for totalitarian warfare. To create a European Federation is therefore definitely the first task upon which the progressive European movements must concentrate all their energies. It is the aim of the MFE to convince them that this is necessary, whilst supporting all movements for national, political and social liberation to direct them to that aim.

VI. The bestialities of this war, the danger of worldwide oppression to which we were all subject, the proven inability of individual States to preserve their own independence and neutrality, all demonstrate with unmistakable clarity that the system of absolute national sovereignty must be abolished. But powerful reactionary forces in the political and economic spheres want to preserve this system because it is useful to them. At the end of this war, in the midst of a short period of national and international crisis, when the structure of the national States will either partly or completely collapse we must seek to lay the foundations of real peace. This time there must be no repetition of 1919; the peace settlement must not be the outcome of diplomatic intrigue and the ambitions of ministers as though it were no concern of the people how the peace is organized. It will therefore be necessary to give firm support to that country or those countries which favour the creation of a federal organization and to mobilize within every nation all popular forces behind this demand for a federal solution. For only during such a revolutionary period, and so long as the memories of the horrors of wars are still alive, will the European Federation be able to withstand pettiness, treason and nationalist interests and become a reality.

If we allow this decisive moment to go by, the progressive forces will have fought in vain, whatever their achievements may be in other spheres. New forms of Fascism and Nationalism will soon again raise their monstrous heads. For this reason the MFE seeks to mobilize the political forces it can influence not for an aim to be realized in the distant future; it seeks to use the imminent critical period to erect the only effective barrier against the inhuman scourge of total war that is open to civilized nations: a political structure which guarantees the free development of national culture, civil liberties and socialist institutions and which paves the way for the creation of a world federation of free peoples at a later date.

### *General Directives*

The Movement should leave its members free to form detailed

conclusions about the various political and social problems that present themselves in the European context, and should encourage such studies. But it should not at this stage commit itself to over-precise statements of policy concerning the future European Federation and connected problems, because too many data are still fluid and uncertain, both nationally and internationally. It is a firm principle, however, that a federalist attitude excludes all forms of totalitarianism and any forms of unity that are hegemonistic or, while apparently federalist, are subject to the iron control of totalitarian bodies. On this understanding the Movement is in accord with all progressive forces and tendencies favourable to the creation of a European Federation, from Communists to Liberals in the strict sense, and it does not take up an *a priori* position as to the exact degree of collectivism or capitalism, democracy or authority, that may be permissible in such a federation. We are in fact convinced that a federal structure is a necessary condition for the development of free political life. Only through such revolution can the problems of each country be solved in such a way as to make use of all the forces which together maintain the essential values of our civilization. We are not afraid of any excesses or defects that may be present in the initial stages. Different evaluations of this or that force, this or that foreign State are today of an essentially personal character and cannot provide any ground for differentiation.

## Interview with Altiero Spinelli

### *1. From the Ventotene Manifesto to the foundation of the MFE, 1941-1943*

1. *Question:* You were arrested in 1927. Can you tell me when you were interned on Ventotene? When did you meet Ernesto Rossi and Eugenio Colomi?

*Reply:* I was arrested in Milan on June 3rd 1927. I was sentenced to 16 years 8 months prison by the special court, but I spent only 10 years in prison because of partial amnesties in the meantime. In the spring of 1937, instead of being freed, I was sent into internal exile on Ponza and in June 1939 I was transferred from Ponza to the colony on Ventotene where I met Eugenio Colomi, who was already interned there with his wife (who is now my wife) and Ernesto Rossi who came to the island a couple of months after I did, when he had finished his term in prison.

2. *Question:* In your biographical account *Pourquoi je suis européen* you write that in 1937 you broke definitively with the Communist Party. When did you move towards European federalism? At the beginning of the war or even before that? What events or observations were decisive for the development of federalist ideas? Was the idea of a federated Europe developed by Spinelli, Rossi and Colomi separately or was it the result of common discussions on Ventotene?

*Reply:* As I explained in *Pourquoi je suis européen*, after I split with the Italian Communist Party in Summer 1937, I thought for a long time about the problems of democracy without reaching any satisfactory conclusions for a couple of years. In the first half of 1939 I read Einaudi's articles published in *Corriere della Sera* at the end of 1918 attacking the League of Nations and supporting a European federation, several essays by English federalists and also Meinecke's book *Nationalstaat und Staatsraison* with its analysis of the problems created by the contrast between the needs of the (existing) Prussian state and the (desired but inexistent) German state and its reflections on Europe's march towards a new World War. I was struck by the idea that after the fall of Fascism and Nazism, the future of Europe should be sought not in the simple restoration of national democracies but in the creation of a European Federation. This conviction was strengthened by the fact that war broke out and by the subsequent collapse of all the states in Continental Europe under Hitler's aggression.

This idea was initially born from discussions between me and Rossi about the essays, books and events I have just mentioned. When we began to discuss the idea with other people, Eugenio Colomi and his wife Ursula were among the first to accept it. The final decision to draw up the Manifesto and try to distribute in Europe was taken by Rossi and myself around mid-1941.

3. *Question:* In the literature (Delzell, Lipgens) we find that as soon as the internees on Ventotene reached the conclusion that a European Federation was needed they turned to the *Federalist Papers* and works of British federalists in the Federal Union for greater clarity, and from the study of these texts and their discussion emerged the Ventotene Manifesto. Apart from the fact that it was certainly very difficult to get hold of books of this kind in the internal exile, I find it rather hard to believe that internees could read books, all of which — with the exception of *Federalist Papers* — appeared only in 1938 or later on (Streit's *Union Now*, Lionel Robbins' etc.). In other words, I would like to know which books the federalists Ernesto Rossi, Altiero Spinelli and Eugenio

Colomi had on Ventotene before they wrote the Manifesto. Had they read the *Federalist Papers* by Hamilton, Jay and Madison? Did they know about the federalist texts of Lionel Robbins, Walter Layton, William Beveridge, Barbara Wootton?

*Reply:* We managed to read the British federalist essays, which I mentioned in reply to your second question in the following way: Luigi Einaudi, then Professor of Economics in the University of Turin was among the very few great liberal intellectuals, together with Benedetto Croce, whom Fascism granted a certain freedom of expression (think, for example, to get an idea, of Sacharov today). He had been authorized to correspond on economic matters with Ernesto Rossi, also a Professor of Economics, for years even though Rossi was in jail, and even managed to send him a few books of economics in Italian or some other language. At a certain point in time, at the beginning of 1939, we chanced upon the *Lettere politiche* of Junius, published by Laterza in 1920. Junius was the pseudonym which Einaudi had used during and after the First World War when writing in the *Corriere della Sera*. There we found among his 1918 articles, a few which criticized the League of Nations and defended the idea of European Federalism.

Ernesto Rossi asked Einaudi if he could send him some studies on this subject and Einaudi sent him various essays on British Federalists, the subject of which I remember but whose names I forget except for one. I cannot remember the names because after the Liberation I managed to read a considerable quantity of British Federalist literature in the thirties in the library of the League of Nations in Geneva, and today I am not able to say who among Layton, Beveridge, Wootton and others I read on Ventotene and who I read in Geneva. I am sure that we did not know about Clarence Streit's *Union now*. The only specific book I remember is L. Robbins *The economic causes of war* which I translated on Ventotene and which subsequently Einaudi, the publishers, published without my name.

Do not be surprised if Einaudi managed to receive anything from England before Italy entered the war or send anything there.

As I told you before the police showed him a minimum of respect.

Hamilton's, Jay's and Madison's *Federalist Papers* were known to us through the books I mentioned before, which practically were inspired by all of these writers, but we were able to read them only in 1944 in Geneva.

4. *Question:* Carlo Rosselli had published a series of articles in Paris on the need for a European federation in his *Quaderni di Giustizia e Libertà*. Did the Ventotene internees know of these articles?

*Reply:* I did not know Rosselli's articles, and probably not even Rossi knew them, since I do not remember him speaking about them to me on Ventotene.

5. *Question:* The Ventotene Manifesto was written by Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi. Were there any other internees who took part in the group's discussions? What role did Colomi have in drawing up the Manifesto? The third part of the Manifesto ("Reform of Society") is very close to the ideas Rosselli expressed in his book *Socialismo liberale*. Was this part written by Rossi, who had been one of the representatives of *Giustizia e Libertà* in Italy?

*Reply:* The Ventotene Manifesto was written by me almost entirely. As you have rightly guessed Rossi wrote the first part of Chapter III — "Postwar tasks. Reform of Society" — as far as the end of the paragraph on corporatism. From the paragraph "The revolutionary party cannot be amateurishly ...etc." to the end of the Manifesto was written once again by me. But we discussed the whole thing together and I still recognize the characteristic thinking of one of the two of us in the parts written by the other.

Colomi took no part in the editorial work. For that reason in publishing it in *Problemi della Federazione europea*, he only wrote the initials A.S. and E.R. and not his own.

6. *Question:* In what way and by whom was the text of the

Manifesto brought from the internment camp to the mainland in July 1941?

*Reply:* The Manifesto, and subsequently my two essays, as well as the first exchange of clandestine letters with the first readers of the Manifesto on the mainland, were taken in 1941 by Ursula Hirschmann Colomi, who had not yet be interned, but who had obtained the right to live with her husband and daughters on Ventotene. She could come and go freely between the island, Rome and Milan and was our messenger.

My two sisters — Fiorella and Gigliola, and Ada Rossi, Ernesto's wife — who came to see us in the internment camp — were also our messengers, particularly after the Colomi family was transferred from Ventotene to Melfi in Southern Italy.

*7. Question:* Can you tell me to what extent the Manifesto was distributed in Italy from 1941 to the first printed edition in August 1943? Who dealt with the distribution of the text? Could Ignazio Silone in Zurich have known anything about it in 1942 when his newspaper *L'avvenire dei lavoratori* argued the need to create the European Federation after the war had ended? And what about Silvio Trentin in France?

*Reply:* The Manifesto and other things I wrote were made known in Rome and Milan by Ursula Hirschmann to the anti-Fascists with whom she was in contact. Among the first to accept the idea of constituting a federalist movement were: Mario A. Rollier, Guglielmo Usellini, the three Spinelli brothers and sisters (Cerilo, Gigliola, Fiorella). With their help Ursula Colomi also published and had the first (illegal) issue of *L'Unità Europea* distributed in May 1943.

I am not in a position to assess the degree of penetration of federalist writings. Remember that a single illegal page was read by many people and very often copied out with a typewriter and cyclostyled here and there before being destroyed. Certainly the anti-Fascist circles in Rome, Milan and Turin in 1943 directly or indirectly knew about the Manifesto.

I do not know if Silone knew about it in 1942. I do not think Trentin could have known about it in France.

*8. Question:* In Autumn 1941, Colomi was taken from Ventotene to a prison on the mainland from which he managed to escape much later (when?). On his arrival in Rome he found a small group of federalists. Are the people who were active in this group still known?

*Reply:* Colomi fled from Melfi (where he was not a prisoner but an internee) a few months before Mussolini's fall. In Melfi a small group of political internees who believed in federalism grew up around him and his wife Ursula: Ada Rossi, Franco Venturi, Manlio Rossi Doria.

In Rome and Milan, Ursula, as I said before, had obtained the first enrolments, and Eugenio Colomi met these people when he fled from Melfi and came clandestinely to Rome.

*9. Question:* On August 27/28th 1943 about twenty people founded the MFE in Mario Alberto Rollier's house in Milan. So far, however, I have not managed to identify all those people who took part in the meeting founding the MFE. From my research it is certainly clear only that the following were there: Rollier, Altiero Spinelli, Eugenio Colomi, Ernesto Rossi, Ada Rossi, Gigliola Spinelli, Leone Ginzburg, Guglielmo Jervis, Ursula Hirschmann and Vindice Cavallera. Who were the other people present? Were there also Vittorio Foa, Franco Venturi, Enrico Giussani, Dino Roberto, Giorgio Braccialarghe, Buleghin and Arialdo Banfi?

*Reply:* After so many years it is possible that I have forgotten one or two names, but I do not think so. Here is the list of those who I certainly remember as being present at the foundation of the MFE in Rollier's house: 1) A. Spinelli, 2) Eugenio Colomi, 3) Ernesto Rossi, 4) Ursula Hirschmann, 5) Ada Rossi, 6) Mario Alberto Rollier, 7) Rita Rollier, 8) Gigliola Spinelli, 9) Franco Venturi, 10) Fiorella Spinelli, 11) Guglielmo Jervis, 12) Vindice Cavallera, 13)

Manlio Rossi Doria, 14) Vittorio Foa, 15) Enrico Giussani, 16) Dino Roberto, 17) Giorgio Braccialarghe, 18) Arturo Buleghin, 19) Belgioioso, the architect, 20) Arialdo Banfi, 21) Giangio Banfi, 22) Luisa Usellini. Missing at the meeting were Guglielmo Usellini and Cerilo Spinelli because they had been arrested at the beginning of August by the Carabinieri while distributing leaflets which invited people to get ready for the war against the Nazis.

10. *Question:* The PSIUP's (*Partito Socialista Italiano di Unità Proletaria*) programme after July 25th 1943 contains a small passage in which the party calls for the creation of a "free federation of states" to destroy the capitalist system of society etc. in Europe. Can you tell me if this passage is from Colomi?

*Reply:* The federalist passage in the PSIUP programme of July 1943 was the work of Eugenio Colomi. It was the condition under which he became a member of the PSIUP's Executive.

11. *Question:* Apart from the *Partito d' Azione*, the *Movimento Neoguelfo*, set up by Piero Malvestiti, Edoardo Clerici and others was the only political party with a clear federalist vision of foreign policy in Summer 1943. Do you know if their Milan Programme which begins with a demand for the European Federation was influenced by the federalists?

*Reply:* I cannot say how Malvestiti and Clerici managed to get a clear federalist vision. I met both, but it never occurred to me to ask them whether they were influenced by us or not.

12. *Question:* What was the reaction of the political parties to the MFE's appeal to commit themselves primarily to the creation of the European Federation in August 1943?

*Reply:* Before the fall of Fascism, the Ventotene internees Communists, Socialists, followers of *Giustizia e Libertà* — with a few individual exceptions (let's say: Colomi, Giussani, Roberto, Buleghin, the young Slav Lokar, an old Republican whose name

I have forgotten) — reacted very harshly to Rossi's and my appeal.

In Melfi and on the mainland in general, thanks to Ursula's work, only a few other names were added.

During the months when Badoglio was in power, when the parties were reconstituted, the Communists remained hostile and extraneous, all the others accepted the novelty of the idea, some in a confused way, others in a clearer way, but they all included it in their programme albeit in a distracted manner. After the war, they all forgot about it, and only began to think about it when the Marshall Plan came along.

The members of the MFE in those difficult years came from the *Partito d' Azione*, and to a lesser extent from the Socialist Party and only minimally from the Christian Democrat Party.

## II - Federalism in the years of the Resistance 1943-1945

1. *Question:* When precisely did you escape to Switzerland with Ernesto Rossi?

*Reply:* I did not "escape". On August 28th at the end of the Congress founding the MFE, we decided it was necessary to get in touch with the federalists who "certainly" had to exist even in other countries. Rossi and I got the job of going to "discover" them, because it was difficult to think of and prepare for Federalist action only in Italy. So myself, Ursula Hirschmann and Ernesto Rossi went to Switzerland towards mid-September 1943, in the flood of refugees but actually as "missionaries" for the MFE.

2. *Question:* Had Luigi Einaudi already joined the MFE in Italy before September 8th 1943, or did he join only later in Switzerland?

*Reply:* Ernesto Rossi found his master Luigi Einaudi in Geneva, told him that the MFE had come from his *Lettere politiche* of 1913 and invited him to join with us. Einaudi stayed with us from that time in the MFE until his death.

3. *Question:* As well as *I problemi economici della Federazione europea* did Luigi Einaudi write further federalist articles in Switzerland between 1943 and 1945?

*Reply:* Probably, but I don't remember.

4. *Question:* The founding group of the MFE entrusted to Spinelli and Rossi with the job of getting in touch with the other federalist groups in the Resistance movements of other European countries. How did his attempts to get in touch with these groups come about?

*Reply:* In Switzerland I set myself up with Ursula Hirschmann in Bellinzona; Ernesto Rossi with his wife in Geneva. We began

to cyclostyle and circulate federalist material (illegally, because refugees were not allowed to undertake any political activity), not just among the Italian refugees, but also among the numerous Swiss democrats who sympathised with the Italian anti-Fascists and helped them. We thus contacted Silone, François Bondy and Hanna Bertholet (he was Swiss, she German), with Hilda Monte (German), the Swiss European Union, then directed by the German Social Democrat Ritzel, Soutou and Laloi, representing Free France in Geneva and Visser t'Hofft. In other words, we discovered that what we had predicted was correct. European federalism was, in actual fact, a plant that had sprung up everywhere in occupied Europe. In that period Ernesto Rossi collected together a preliminary set of documents from the clandestine European press which spoke of federation and published it at Baconnière in Neuchâtel in his book *L'Europe de demain*.

5. *Question:* What role did Spinelli and Rossi have in the development of the meetings of the representatives of the Resistance movements in 8 countries in Geneva in Spring 1944? The Federalist Declaration, which these Resistance members voted on May 20th 1944 in the house of Willem Visser t'Hooft resembles the ideas of the Ventotene federalists on many points. Were Ernesto Rossi and Altiero Spinelli behind it?

*Reply:* The idea of organizing Resistance meetings in Geneva in Spring 1944 was mine and Rossi's. The text of the declaration was drawn up by me and then discussed and perfected with all the others. The meetings are vividly described in Visser t'Hooft's memoirs.

6. *Question:* I found two different dates for the arrest of Eugenio Colomi in May 1944 in Rome: May 27th and May 30th 1944. Which is correct?

*Reply:* At the end of May 1944 Eugenio Colomi was not arrested but shot by Fascists in Via Livorno, Rome. Taken to hospital he died a few days later. I cannot say what the precise date

of the shooting and his death were.

7. *Question*: I have found very few federalist writings by Eugenio Colomi: the preface "Problems of the European Federation"; the introduction to the first issue of *L'Unità Europea* in May 1943; the article "The character of the European federation" (*Unità Europea* n.2, August 1943) and his draft resolution designed to support the first meeting of the *Consiglio Nazionale* of the PSIUP (February 1944). Are there any other federalist writings by him?

*Reply*: I don't think there are any other federalist writings by Eugenio Colomi but since he was the editor of the clandestine *Avanti* in Rome, I suppose that if there are any articles on Europe there, they must be his.

8. *Question*: when did you join the *Partito d'Azione*?

*Reply*: I joined the *Partito d'Azione* towards the middle of 1944, when having, with the Geneva convention, concluded the federalist Resistance declaration, I wanted to return to Italy to participate in the Resistance, too.

In July 1944 I did in fact come back. I went to Milan and was co-opted in the Secretariat of the *Partito d'Azione - Alta Italia*, where I worked with Parri and Valiani, and I directed *Italia Libera* of Milan and *L'Unità Europea* which until then had been directed by M.A. Rollier.

9. *Question*: During the Resistance, the question of European federation had practically disappeared from Italian political parties' agendas — with the sole exception of the *Partito d'Azione* and the tiny Republican Party. Would you say that the Northern section of the *Partito d'Azione* was more federalist than the section in liberated Italy? What role did the theme of European Federation still have in the party's debates in those years?

*Reply*: My presence in the Secretariat of the *Partito d'Azione*-

*Alta Italia* and its newspaper, the presence of Jervis, Galimberti, Rollier in the P. d'A of Piedmont, as well as the dreamy atmosphere of a clandestine movement kept the federalist voice much more alive in the North.

In actual fact, as I already said, the federalist idea, was completely eclipsed in the last year of the war and the first two years of the postwar period, because Europe was not brought to a position where it was forced to raise the question of its new international status. Europe was entirely conquered by the Soviet and Anglo-American forces, who restored the old national states as a matter of course, which were formally sovereign but in actual fact controlled by the conquering forces. The problem of the European order only resurfaced with the Marshall plan.

10. *Question*: The *Partito d'Azione* was clearly divided into a Socialist wing and a Democratic-Republican wing. Is it true to say that the Socialist wing (Lussu, Lombardi) was less favourable to the European Federation and that it saw the solution of European problems in a vague system of European collective security?

*Reply*: The idea of a collective European security system, in the shadow that is of the two Superpowers was not only Lussu's and Lombardi's idea but Salvatorelli's, too. No, most Italian politicians assumed there would be permanent joint American-Russian control with areas in which one or other power predominated.

11. *Question*: Can you tell me whether the publisher *Nuove edizioni Capolago* in Lugano which published all the writings of the Italian federalists in Switzerland in 1944 belonged to the Republican brothers Egidio and Oronzo Reale?

*Reply*: I do not know who the owners of *Nuove edizioni Capolago* in Lugano were. Perhaps Signora Antonietta Guazzaroni, the daughter of Egidio Reale knows.

12. *Question*: In the month of March 1945 the first European Federalist Conference was held in Paris. Who apart from you and



your wife represented the Italian MFE? Can you briefly summarize the policy carried out in Paris?

*Reply:* The first European federalist conference in Paris was a consequence of the Geneva declaration. This occurred when France was still occupied, and the declaration reached Lyons where a *Comité français pour la Fédération européenne* had been set up. Shortly after the liberation, the *Comité* (in which Camus, Baumel and others in the MLN took part) launched an invitation to hold a federalist conference in Paris. I got the invitation in Milan, went back to Switzerland in December 1944 and from there I went back clandestinely with Ursula to Paris. Ursula organized the Conference. The political driving force was me. Among those present I can remember Camus, Orwell, Mounier, Philip, Ferrat. It was the last flame of Resistance federalism. We published two pamphlets on that occasion in Paris. I was "Altier" and "Antonelli". The *Résolution* was drawn up by me.

There were no other representatives of the Italian MFE present.

### *III. Federalism between 1945 and 1947*

1. *Question:* At the end of the war you withdrew from the Federalist movement because you felt that the international situation determined by the Yalta conference no longer permitted any political European Union. Were you convinced that the opportunity for Europe had gone by forever, or did you think it was a temporary setback?

*Reply:* I was following the way things were shaping very carefully. I did not believe in any lasting joint American and Russian control. I was waiting.

2. *Question:* When did you become Secretary of the *Partito d'Azione*?

*Reply:* In May 1945 the Alta Italia and Rome Secretariats were merged into a single collective secretariat which I belonged to.

3. *Question:* Did the theme of European Unity still have any meaning for the *P. d'A* between 1945 and 1947 or was this party exclusively committed, like all the others, to national issues, i.e. the Constituent Assembly, the battle for the Republic and economic reconstruction?

*Reply:* No. The issue of European unity was no longer topical even in the *P. d'A*. I stayed there for as long as I could, merely attempting to keep a powerful political position while waiting for Europe's hour to return.

4. *Question:* When did Prof. Umberto Campagnolo take over the running of the MFE, in the Milan meeting in September 1945 or already before?

*Reply:* I don't remember the date when Campagnolo took over the running of the MFE. I met him on my return from France, in

Milan in May 1945 shortly before leaving for Rome. When I left, the MFE was in the hands of Usellini and Gorini. Shortly after, Campagnolo took over the running.

5. *Question:* In January 1946 you sent a letter to a group of federalists meeting in Florence inviting them to abstain from any federalist propaganda and instead commit themselves to national politics. Can you give me the precise content of your letter? Where was it published the first time?

*Reply:* I do not know where it was published. But it was read out in the Florence meeting.

6. *Question:* Under the guidance of Campagnolo the objectives of the MFE became somewhat vague and confused. The debate which arose in the Movement (in particular at the First Congress in October 1946 in Venice) seemed to gravitate more around socialist ends than federalist ends. Is it correct to say that in 1946 the MFE was dominated by socialist forces coming from the left-wing of the PSIUP (i.e. those called "Social Communist")?

*Reply:* Your judgement on Campagnolo's leadership is correct. I do not believe that the PSIUP or its left wing fraction was ever interested in the MFE. But men who considered themselves as being on the Socialist left, tried to move the MFE onto their positions. I must confess, however, that neither at that time nor even subsequently was I interested in the MFE in that period so that my information on it should not be considered as very reliable.

7. *Question:* When did you leave the *P. d'A*?

*Reply:* I left the *P. d'A* after its Rome Congress in February 1946 with La Malfa and Parri. And I rapidly abandoned them, not concerning myself with politics for some time; *Ich lag brach*.

8. *Question:* In December 1946 the *Union Européenne des Fédéralistes* was set up in Paris. Did you take part in the

preparation for this meeting?

*Reply:* I did not take part in this meeting. I made contact with the UEF only in the Montreux Congress after I had recommenced my federalist action.

9. *Question:* At the Constituent Assembly a federalist group had already been set up which managed to introduce the celebrated Article 11 of the Italian Constitution (\*). How many Parliamentarians took part in this group and who was the President?

*Reply:* I did not follow the work of the Constituent and I cannot give you the information you require.

10. *Question:* On June 5th 1947 in Harvard the American Secretary of State George Marshall announced the offer of vast American help on condition that the European States agreed to formulate a common programme for European reconstruction. However, none of the European Governments had understood the true dimensions of the American initiative. This is true for the Italian Prime Minister De Gasperi and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Sforza, who only saw generous economic help and at the very most a generic renewal of the European Unity issue. But what was the reaction of Einaudi who was then minister for the State Budget? Are you aware of any statement of position by Einaudi in Summer 1947 as regards the necessary consequences of the Marshall Plan? (I only found his speech given in the MFE meeting in the Teatro Sistina in Rome in October 1947, in which it was stated among other things that it was not possible to have any faith in treaties between sovereign states).

---

(\*) - Art. 11 of the Italian Constitution lays down : "Italy repudiates war as an instrument of attack on the freedom of other peoples and as a means of resolving international controversies; it consents, in conditions of parity with the other States, to the limitations of sovereignty necessary to guarantee an order based on peace and justice between nations; it promotes and encourages international organizations designed for this end".

*Reply:* I do not think that of his own initiative Einaudi appreciated the European consequences of the Marshall Plan. But when Rossi, who like me did feel them, thought that it was necessary to relaunch the MFE and organized the October 1947 meeting, Einaudi backed the idea.

11. *Question:* What was your immediate reaction to the Harvard speech?

*Reply:* My immediate reaction was that the issue of European unification was reopened with Marshall's speech in terms of effective political action. I began to write various articles on this subject in Venice, particularly in *Italia socialista*, the daily newspaper directed by Garosci and finally I decided with Rossi that we would run the MFE once more, and be involved in the battle for Europe once more.

12 *Question:* Were there between 1945 and 1947, contacts between the MFE and Italian politicians, the Government and the Constituent Assembly?

*Reply:* I don't think so. However, if there were they were not significant. The first major renewal of contacts with the political world was precisely the Teatro Sistina Conference organized by Ernesto Rossi.

## Contents

<i>The Ventotene Manifesto: the Only Road to Follow</i> by Mario Albertini	p. 3
Preface	» 11
Towards a Free and United Europe. A Draft Manifesto	» 17
I. The Crisis of Modern Civilization	» 19
II. Postwar Tasks. European Unity	» 26
III. Postwar Duties. Reform of Society	» 34
APPENDICES	
The Foundation of the MFE. Political Thesis	» 41
Interview with Altiero Spinelli	» 50

Finito di stampare nel giugno 1988  
dalla Tipografia Pi-Me Pavia