

ENTREVISTA A ROMANO MUSSOLINI: “WITHOUT MY FATHER THERE WOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN SUCH A THING AS FASCISM”

Jan Nelis

Universiteit Gent, Belgium.

Recibido: 13 Marzo 2005 / Revisado: 10 Abril 2005 / Aceptado: 12 Mayo 2005 / Publicado: 15 Junio 2005

Resumen: This interview is about Romano Mussolini's biography, the Italian dictator's son and father of the neofascist Alexandra Mussolini. It analyses his personal trajectory and reflects on his father's figure who he considered "a great man". It considers that the fascism embodied a typical Italian ideal and that the specific way in which it took place was inspired by the powerful personality of his father. It is attributed to the Italian society as a whole, included the intellectuals, a position of positive support towards the fascist government meanwhile the liberal and "communist fans" opposition is thought as irrelevant.

Palabras clave: communism, fascism, Italian society, Italy, liberalism, Mussolini, Romano Mussolini, XXth Century.

Romano Mussolini was born in 1927 from Benito Mussolini and Rachele Guidi. Before even having reached an adult age, he heard of the death of his father, shot and then strung up in a *piazza* in Milan. After WWII he became known as a jazz pianist, in Italy as well as abroad. He is also the father of neofascist politician Alessandra, who used her family name to start a political career in Italy, first on the Alleanza Nazionale list, then with her own list, after a dispute with Gianfranco Fini. We had the rare opportunity to speak to Romano on two occasions, in the Fall and Winter of 2003. He spoke freely about himself and above all about his father, whose memory he cherishes deeply, as will appear from the interview. We will render it in the simple form of question-answer, without adding critical notes. Having said that, we do however hope that readers have the necessary critical luggage and soundness of mind to weigh and judge Romano Mussolini's words.

Jan Nelis: You seem to me to have a double personality: on the one side you're the famous jazz musician Romano Mussolini, on the other side you're the son of fascism's *duce* Benito Mussolini. What is the importance of music in your life?

Romano Mussolini: For me, music is a way of living. In time it has become a stronghold for me, an element of joy, for my mind, for my life, up until today.

JN: One could see life as art, as action, in a way even as theatre, as a developing process. What pushes you in life, what is in other words the engine, the catalyst as you wish?

RM: Every man that has self respect has a certain ambition, the ambition to do better. For me that's the engine, but there can be other factors, for example the desire to have an economic career. I think it's important to live in sincerity, respecting friendship and relationships with others. For me, having a sense of humour is very important. From my point of view, he who does not have that, does not exist. And that counts for women as well [sic].

JN: At the beginning of your career you played under a false name, 'Romano Full'. This makes me think of the postwar antifascist debate, when fascism became in a certain sense taboo. How have you experienced this paralyzing judgement, this demonization?

RM: I used the false name because I could not use my own name as I was not subscribed to the author's list. My own name did not exist so to speak. Full is a strike in poker: I was playing poker when they told me: "Hey, we have to find

something for the author's list." So I said: "Well then, why not Full?"

JN: So it was not because you were afraid of being judged because of your name?

RM: Not at all. I have always played after the Second World War. Furthermore, even during the War there was always music, jazz...

JN: It has always seemed awkward to me that fascism has been very heavily criticized –and as you know often very bitterly–, but never been defined in a clear and univocal manner. It is as if people don't really know what it is. Could you tell me what fascism means to you?

RM: Fascism for me is the sense of the fatherland. First of all, we feel Italian. We are patriots. It was a sentimental question. But there is also the great charisma my father had among the people: that was the most important. When you see that now, after so many years, articles, magazines, books, films etcetera appear on a daily base! It's a character that everyone wants to study. Everybody wants to know who he was. Because you can't just ignore what has been done, and especially what has been done in a good way.

JN: Can the term "fascism" be used as a generic concept or is it rather something typically Italian?

RM: I think it's a typically Italian ideal. But the motor, the man handling the machines, was my father. Without my father there would never have been such a thing as fascism.

JN: What do you think of the so-called consensus with the fascist regime? How would you characterize it?

RM: I have lived during the reign of fascism, and the majority was in favour! Had that not been so, then they could never have done what they have done: the constructions, the laws... According to me they were all fascists, and they were convinced. Convinced. Convinced.

All right, there are always those who are contrary, but they were just few, and mainly old liberals, or fanatical communists, but they were few. There haven't been many demonstrations against fascism.

JN: Are you interested in studies about fascism? I'm thinking for example of the controversy around Renzo De Felice¹ and his biography of your father?

RM: I have read a lot of books on fascism, one just recently, about the Rex², the transatlantic steamboat, one of the prides of fascism. I've read De Felice, I've read the books my father wrote, as well as a lot of volumes of the *Opera Omnia*³, this mostly out of personal interest, because this character interested me from a historical point of view, not as his son. Therefore I have been able to judge everything very objectively.

JN: You've lived in the household of Benito Mussolini. Everybody knows him, or people think they know him, as head of the Italian government during the ventennio fascista. Believe, obey, struggle were key words during the ventennio. These seem harsh words, words which one wouldn't place that easily in the context of family, of the household. Were these principles also valid for your education at Mussolini's household? How would you describe your education in relation to the "external", "official" side of your father?

RM: Look here, one thing is the public exteriorization of the leader of a party, of every party. Believe, obey, struggle was a question of ideology, because this feeling of believe, obey and struggle was a part of the ideology of fascism. "They're harsh words." No! They are very important words, because the majority believed in them. In my family we were plain sons and daughters, who were not at all abandoned to our fate. I owe everything to my family, to my parents, all that they have given me. I shall never be able to thank them enough. I shall thank them till the end of my days. All the good I have, I owe to my family. It's a very tight family, with my brothers and sisters, father and mother. We felt Italian, patriotic. What was it all about? The name of Italy, the honour of Italy.

JN: Was there a difference between the public figure and Benito Mussolini in private, dad, father of his children?

RM: Of course! One thing is the private person, another the public. All great men in history have a public, exterior part. However, I think my father always remained himself. The sense of friendship he had, his generosity –even with his opponents– he had these also at home. He

treated us with a lot of affection, with friendship.

JN: Was there a difference between the people's Mussolini, that of the fascists and that of the government?

RM: It is clear that everyone sees the character from their own point of view. I personally think my father was mostly in love with Italy, with the nation. It was a big design, a design for a strong Italy, respected in the world. This went for all: for us, for the fascists, for the Italians. My father came from the people, so he devoted himself above all to the people, with public constructions, drainings, laws... In the writings you could often read "to go toward the people": he knew he was the only prime minister that came from the people, not from the bourgeoisie. He wasn't a typical politician. He was a people's man with a great charisma and a great personality. For, hadn't he had this personality, then he could never have had such a fascinating effect, then he could never have governed this nation for so long a period.

JN: How did he get on with the fascists?

RM: The fascists were his companions in the streets. With them, he developed this great design called fascism: the corporate state, the Chamber of the fasci of the corporations. This, according to me, is returning in a certain sense today. I wouldn't say that it's "fashionable", that it never is, but it has a certain value, also in modern politics. It was a state in which there were two parts: the politics of the fasci and work, labour, the corporations. For that reason, all elements of work and of the professional world were represented in the Chamber. I think that's something very forward looking. It should also be a roadmap for the near future. At the moment, there is a big confrontation between the world of labour and the world of politics. I think we should integrate trade unions, the world of labour, in the government. I would make sure unions have a responsibility in government policy. It is very easy to criticize and organize demonstrations without offering real alternatives! I would be very pleased with a state in which workers are represented by trade unions. I don't know if it's a utopia, but I think it might work.

JN: Concerning the position and behaviour of intellectuals during fascist government: there seems to have been a certain degree of liberty,

but there were also limitations. How do you see this tension liberty-limitations?

RM: The intellectuals had accepted fascism to a high degree. Even Benedetto Croce was initially a fascist [...], not to speak of all the Italian "academics": Pirandello, Marconi, all the great painters, the Futurists, Marinetti! No, in my opinion there was a lot of room for art and culture, figurative art as well as music. There is a book out now, on my father as a music lover, "L'orchestra del duce" it is called⁴. It's interesting to learn about his taste: classical music, symphonic. he really loved every kind of music, as long as it was good. Music has to be good, then it is worth something.

JN: Your father read a lot and spoke various languages. Could you give me a description of his 'internal library'?

RM: He came from a family of politicians: his father was a politician, his mother a teacher, so he was an educated man, himself also a teacher. He read, spoke two languages: he spoke French well, German, a bit of English. He had studied German; he was a French teacher. He had a library consisting of classics, poets... Especially the poets he loved, foreigners, to name only a few: Goethe, Byron. But there were also the Italians: Leopardi, Carducci, D'Annunzio. As I said he also had a classical library, I remember him reading them. So he was a man who read a lot, who read nearly all the papers. Every day he wanted to know what the newspapers wrote. Being a journalist, he was very interested in the newspapers. He was an educated man, indeed an unusual sight in the nineteenth century. You should know that in Italy, in the nineteenth century, 80% of all people could read nor write, so they couldn't buy books or newspapers. 80%, whereas in other countries it was the opposite, like in Germany, but also in the United States! Considering the nineteenth century, Italy was the most underdeveloped nation in Europe, until the arrival of fascism, with schools. Everyone could go to university now! From then on, parents were the only ones who couldn't read. Much of my mother's family members, who were peasants, could read nor write. My mother had gone to school until the third year of elementary school. She was a very intelligent person, but that was all she could do. But she had that sense of countrylife, that cunningness which peasants have. She lived according to proverbs, of the many things that constitute the logic of country life.

JN: Being an Italian, what was the bond your father had with Rome?

RM: I can tell you what the interest of my father in this city was, what his love was. Of the many cities that exist it is the one which has owned the most works of art, like the EUR... Take a look, for example, at the later finished *Palazzo della Civiltà*: it shows you what the EUR was and had to become. The whole of *romanità*, the meaning of *romanità* for my father, the symbols: everybody can tell you about that. That's the way history is. Look, except the Roman salute, which is an external element, the *romanità* was of Etruscan origin: look at the *fasci*, they are Etruscan. This shows the importance of ancient Rome, of the symbols of the classics, the orators. That's a known story. The first time my father visited Rome, he was deeply impressed, had a shock, had a vision, partly because Rome then was not Rome as you see it today. Look at eighteenth-century Rome, at the travellers that visited the city, at the ruins, at Goethe etcetera. My father has always been in love with this city.

JN: Are you only thinking of ancient Rome or of, let's say, the whole of Rome?

RM: The whole of Rome. My father knew history very well, was a practician of history. He knew the history of Etruscan Rome very well, knew perfectly the ancient Rome of the great personalities, but also Medieval Rome. He had read that splendid book by Gregorovius⁵ and paraphrased it constantly. Rome, the Medieval city. Rome, city of the popes. He reached the *Concordato* [the so-called *Patti Lateranensi* of 1929 between the Italian state and the Vatican] because he realized the importance of the Vatican for Rome, of the millennial, no bimillennial Church. This can not be ignored, the people can not be ignored. Concerning religion: even today there are people that believe they will earn a ticket to paradise when they blow themselves up. So...

JN: So we can assert that essentially he wasn't religious?

RM: My father was a pragmatic: he understood, intuitively and very well, the importance of the Vatican, of an agreement with the Vatican. He wanted to solve a conflict that had been dragging on for more than 50 years, even 60, 70. This is also an aspect of *romanità*, because the papacy is *romanità*. He was very interested in this issue, also on a political level, because he

was before all a politician. He did these things out of a sense of acknowledgement, acknowledgement for what has been done. Look at the *Via della Conciliazione*! Rome was a big love for my father, Rome hypersymbolized Italy for him. Rome was the fatherland, also because the Italian state had just recently been formed, in 1870.

JN: Because without Rome...

RM: Indeed, everybody knew that a state without Rome had no reason to exist.

JN: So Rome was necessary?

RM: Of course. And take a look at all that Rome possessed: important architects, for the urbanistic plans, which afterwards have half been implemented. And then there was the EUR, which had to be a great exposition of civilization! Also in the field of architecture and schools it was a great period in Roman and Italian civilization. I don't know how the Italian government, with the money they then had, pulled it off, all those constructions, with which the whole of Italy changed. In my opinion, Italian unity and the symbol of Rome, *romanità* in other words, has always existed. This has always existed in fascism. Even more so, I would dare to say that the core of fascism is *romanità*. Look at it all: the symbols, the lictors etcetera. It starts with the fascio, which is Roman-Etruscan, but which already shows what it's all about: what he thought of, from the beginning and from the beginning of fascism. I think my father was already fascinated by Rome in his youth. The first time he visited Rome, he cried. That was in 1915. He was moved, at the sight of Rome. It is a name, only Rome is. world history. *Roma caput mundi*. He was in love with Rome, wanted to make her even more beautiful than she already was. Rome is a unique city, has 4 civilizations: the Roman, the Middle Ages, the *Rinascimento* and the nineteenth century. And then there is fascist architecture.

JN: Was he as fascinated by Rome when he was still a socialist?

RM: Always. My father has always been in love with *romanità* and Rome, the city I mean. He saw the great splendour of the Roman Empire throughout the centuries, her force. Therefore, up until today there is still that respect, that return to Roman antiquity, which has always

existed. You have to imagine that all, even when Rome had nearly become a village, came to Rome to be crowned poet, you see? Maybe it was to a certain extent a symbolical element, but not very much so, because being crowned a poet in Rome.

JN: And before the March on Rome, in 1922, was there such a thing as *romanità*? What has fascism contributed to *romanità*?

RM: Of course! Of course, because with this cultural direction, with this historical direction, fascism has contributed to *romanità* and still does in my opinion.

JN: So, in you father's conscience, Rome was present at all times, as an example and as an ideal.

RM: The Roman Empire is more present than any other empire. The Egyptian Empire for example had its peak much earlier than Rome, but is not, so to speak, politically present. The fascination for ancient Rome and the memory of what it was, have always existed: take a look at Roman law. All wanted to come to Rome, for the *romanità*. Look at the Capitol in New York... [sic] The Pantheon is the symbol of what it could be, except for Saint-Peter's, which is the symbol of Christianity. The Roman monuments live on in so many contemporary art forms: whereas one would never imagine building an Egyptian temple, building a *palazzo* in Rome is impossible without ancient Roman architecture. The fascination of this city begins with the Roman Empire, starting with the Roman Republic. Constantinople was Roman. My father knew Italian history and saw Italy as more present, stronger than it had been the past few centuries, free from the slavery to other countries. As you know Italy has always been occupied by other states, by the French, by the Spaniards. In the same line of reasoning: During the Middle Ages, in the Holy Roman Empire, Charles the Great had himself crowned in Rome, not in Istanbul! So *romanità* has always existed. It is something just that lives on, is present: a modern empire. Whereas the empire of Djenghis Khan has disappeared (where is that man's tomb for God's sake?), here in Rome we have Castel S. Angelo, which used to be the tomb of Hadrian, as well as Circus Maximus: in short all of Rome was important. I cannot emphasize enough: for me this city is unique, unique in the world because it has known 4 civilizations, one of which still exists. Look at the movies: they

still make movies about Julius Caesar, because they're actual characters. Only a while ago there has been a nice book by Mc Cullough⁶, the one who wrote about the Ides of March. She's written a nice book on Caesar's women. Still today that is a success, at a distance of 2000 years! People read stuff that dates back 2000 years! This city is unique, unique, unique. Even if it's not as beautiful as before, because it's obvious that it's overpopulated. But she's beautiful this city she is!

JN: A very loyal fascist like Achille Starace was seen as a bit of a buffoon, according to many of the historical sources. This reminds me of the debate concerning consensus. Do you think this consensus existed among the people?

RM: 'A bit of a buffoon'? That depends. You have to see it in the spirit of the times. In history everything is ridiculous. Look at the great characters, for example Napoleon. He was ridiculous. I have read a lot of books on Napoleon, he was a big pain in the ass [rompiscatole], who also interfered in business that didn't concern him, but he was a genius. And that makes up for a lot.

I belong to those who have always defended Starace, mostly because he has always remained loyal. Furthermore, some things were also original, even if some really didn't work. There was not much protest; Starace was a great party secretary in a beautiful period of fascism. I appreciated him, even though I didn't know him all that well. I've seen him a couple of times and thought highly of him, even if he made mistakes, due to his ideas. But he remained loyal, till the end.

JN: Did he read books on history? On ancient history?

RM: Did he read? But of course! The classics, he knew the Parallel Lives of Plutarchus by heart. He really had a feel for history, not only Roman, but also Greek. He loved classicism, even if he lived in modernity. It is true that fascism looked back at Roman culture, at the culture of antiquity, but it was modern, a modern sense of life, a style as well, an art, everything. I find the fascist experience very important in the life of Italy. Before fascism Italy was a really agrarian state. Fascism was necessary to let everyone go to school, to university. Who made the University of Rome? Splendid! The schools, the laws, the *ludi*

iuvenes, all that he did for culture, that's important. Even the antifascists start to realize that they have been wrong in their negative judgement on this period.

JN: In this context, what does imperialism mean? Does it also look back at Rome?

RM: It was a sentimental imperialism, for Rome, for Italy.

JN: And the difference Rome-Italy? Was there a difference?

RM: Rome was Italy, Italy was Rome. In a spiritual sense.

JN: In his early writings I haven't found many references to antiquity, but it seemed to me that Rome, history, was always present as background. How do you explain this, if *romanità* was propagandistically so important?

RM: You've read the *Opera Omnia*, so you know indeed that those references don't exist. For they are political writings, written for the moment: there are obviously no texts on antiquity. They are political writings that do not involve *romanità*. But it is always present, as you say.

JN: Who was his great example in history (or his great anti-example), or with whom did he identify himself?

RM: He admired many historical characters, maybe above all Caesar. Even if he considered for example Napoleon a genius, he thought he had robbed Italy of so many art treasures (of whom some have returned, others haven't)... So, being in love with Italy, he couldn't really approve that you see.

JN: Your father was born in Emilia Romagna, was a *romagnolo*. At a given moment he said: "*civis romanus sum*."⁷ These two sides, the Roman and the *romagnolo*, were they compatible? And, if so, in what way?

RM: My father was a *romagnolo*, so he felt the traditions of the Romagna-region. He was someone who for many reasons was a child of his region. He considered himself a *romagnolo*, but both sides were compatible, because there was an integration: all Italian regions became

Roman, with the many emperors, first of all Caesar.

JN: You are *Capo* and *Gran Cancelliere* of the Ordine dell'Aquila Romana. What does this Order mean to you?

RM: It's an order my father founded during the *Repubblica Sociale*. At the death of my brother Vittorio I've been appointed head of the order.

JN: Do you feel Roman or romagnolo?

RM: First of all I was born in Romagna, so part of my life has also been there. But also in Rome. So I'm a Roman *romagnolo*. But as I said I was born in Romagna so I feel the place where I was born. My name is Romano. Just the fact that my father called me Romano, shows how important the name of Rome was to my father. The first boy he had after gaining power, he called Romano. I've called my daughter Alessandra, she has a son named Romano. I think it would have given him much joy. My name is Romano [laughs], and now there is even a grandchild named Romano, Alessandra's son. So I too have always had that feeling. I've always lived in Rome, except from some periods in my life. I would never want to leave Rome. I want to die in Rome.

To conclude: I think fascism has been something very important in the life of this nation. It has left undeletable traces and continues to live on. There are lots of polemics, writings... If –this is a joke my brother used to tell– daddy had had the author's rights to the word fascism, then we would now be billionaires. Because everybody says "you're a fascist", in the end Bush is also a fascist, Saddam Hussein... It has a certain universality. Fascism really is something different; it cannot be compared, with nothing or no-one. One cannot consider Franco a fascist. On certain occasions there can be characteristics in someone that can be considered fascist. In this way Churchill was an admirer of fascism. But it was something totally different. Not to speak of communism, which was also totally different. Nazism on the other hand was a military ideology, of the Prussian *junkers*. When someone lived in Germany, he had to be a Nazi; it is fair to say that there were no anti-Nazis. It is a part of the German mind to be indoctrinated, which was not the case in communism. Nazism was an ideal party, with a military character. It was my impression that all German soldiers, people of the military, were Prussian. I think this

is their mistake: there was no possibility of change, because they were all like that. I think there has nearly never been such a total party, really totalitarian like Nazism. By the way, not even communism. First of all, communism has known a very turbulent history, then a man who has governed his nation for many years by means of terror. Doing so he let those closest to him disappear: he has eaten them, devoured them. Communism has devoured itself. I've read that more than 80 per cent of the original *Politburo*, when Stalin gained power, disappeared: it's absurd, has absolutely nothing to do with an ideology... fascism was totalitarian, but not in that way. There's something else: the other revolutions had some of the colour of the French Revolution, with great characters, adventurers, libertines, women etcetera. Communism is grey, terrible. I think it has really been a terrible period for Russia, even if the Russians were used to the czars. A Russian once told me: "Russia needed and needs a strong government. It needed a government like that of your father. Dictatorship was OK, but that of your father, not Stalin's." Stalin was also someone who came into conflict mostly with people from inside the party. Communism has been a continuous failure. Look at for example the famous Chinese Cultural Revolution. The difference was that, whereas the Russians have never forgotten Russian history, the Chinese wanted a *tabula rasa*. They didn't even want to hear Confucius' name mentioned any more! The Cultural Revolution is the most drastic, terrible, that could have happened. If I tell you that they locked up professors that could write! They considered them dangerous. Crazy they were! I've been in China: China is a totalitarian state now, but capitalist. I would nearly say democratic from that point of view. But the State, the party is the boss. The development China is undergoing, wouldn't have been possible without economic freedom. China is really becoming strong!

My father was truly a great man. Also with us. We, the children, respected him as a father, but also because of his charisma, for so many reasons. My father truly was a great man. I don't have to say that, because I'm the son. But I repeat: I remember that in 1945, when my father died, a journalist wrote: "It's over with Mussolini. And of Mussolini we shall speak no more. Never." Imagine, every single day! [laughs loudly] Then there is the case of my daughter, Alessandra, caused by the fact that her name is Mussolini! It is something actual, still

today. Just to say. I don't understand this fear. You can't ignore what has happened, can you? Look, Italy is a nation in which there exists a communist party, that is the strongest left there is, in the true sense of the word. It is not a democratic society like other countries, like Holland, like Belgium. Italians are leftists as fascists were leftists. But this also is an ideological, cultural position of great importance. I think the trade unions should be given responsibility. Let's be honest: they are not numerous. But let's cooperate, otherwise there is no solution. It would be as Fellini said: he said that the true dictator was the director of the orchestra. If he doesn't direct, there is no harmony. How can one govern against the unions? Impossible! Every day there is a strike, a manifestation. What then? You have to give them responsibility. Then we'll see what you want, what's your real proposal. But after profound debating. For there are economic rules... If I raise your wage, inflation goes up, and value is no more. But if I lower it, it's worse. There are economic rules which count for the whole world, also in Russia, China. If you do not produce and go on strike, you can not go forward. That's why I'm a bit pessimistic about this nation. People say: "We want things." But take a look: 90 % of the Italians has two phones, all have tv. Who used to have a tv? All have cars. And they cost! A friend of mine said: a car costs more than a woman. Because at least a woman cooks for you, a car only costs. There are so many cars we don't know any more where to put them. Look at the vespa's! Holidays: everybody is gone now! The unions have to put that into account as well. Is it true that wages are low? Then I see a mystery: how can you sustain that standard of living? Don't you think so? If you earn a million, how can you have 2 cellphones and a phone? Or pay 1000 euros rent? Then there's a mystery. Do you have 2 or 3 jobs maybe? Or is there a lot of corruption in Italy, in other words like in other countries? It is obvious that people have to earn more! They cannot live without television, have to go and see football matches. When I went to a football match, it costed very little. If you go to the derby or any other match today, it can cost you more than 120000 liras. Or 180, that is 100 euros! Nevertheless yesterday: Lazio-Juventus: 72000 spectator. And they pay. Because they say: "You can have one and the other." We'll see how it ends. I'm a bit pessimist in the following sense: look at the situation, with Iraq, the war against the Taliban, and here, and there...

We want too much. Everything costs. You go to a hotel and pay. Who used to go to hotels? Who

had a car? People went on foot, by subway. They had to.

NOTAS

¹ De Felice Renzo, Mussolini il rivoluzionario 1883-1920, 1965, Einaudi, Torino; Mussolini il fascista: La conquista del potere 1921-1925, 1966, Einaudi, Torino ; Mussolini il fascista : L'organizzazione dello Stato fascista 1925-1929, 1968, Einaudi, Torino; Mussolini il duce : Gli anni del consenso 1929-1936, 1974, Einaudi, Torino; Mussolini il duce : Lo Stato totalitario 1936-1940, 1981, Einaudi, Torino; Mussolini l'alleato I. L'Italia in guerra 1940-1943. 1. Dalla Guerra "breve" alla Guerra lunga, 1990, Einaudi, Torino ; Mussolini l'alleato I. L'Italia in guerra 1940- 1943. 2. Crisi e agonia del regime, 1990, Einaudi, Torino ; Mussolini l'alleato II. La guerra civile 1943-1945, 1997, Einaudi, Torino.

² Munzi Ulderico, *Il romanzo del Rex. Un leggendario transatlantico, l'Italia fascista, l'alta società internazionale, le storie del mare*. Sperling & Kupfer, Milano, 2003.

³ Susmel Edoardo/Susmel Duilio, Opera Omnia di Benito Mussolini, 44 vols., 1951-1981, *La Fenice*. Firenze (from vol. 37 on: Giovanni Volpe, Roma).

⁴ Biguzzi Stefano, *L'orchestra del duce. Mussolini, la musica e il mito del capo*. Torino, UTET, 2003.

⁵ Gregorovius Ferdinand, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, 2 vols. Dresden, Jess, 1926.

⁶ Mc Cullough Colleen, *Le donne di Cesare*. Milano, Rizzoli, 1996.

⁷ Cf. Mussolini in Susmel, op. cit., vol. 18:160-161: "Roma è il nostro punto di partenza e di riferimento; è il nostro simbolo o, se si vuole, il nostro mito [...] romano è il nostro orgoglio e il nostro coraggio : 'Civis romanus sum'."