

I met History with a capital H in 1948. The 18th of April. It was the time of the famous general election, which would determine the choice between the Western world and the then soviet Eastern European world. The campaign was bitter. Vote for the Christian Democratic Party (Partito della Democrazia Cristiana; DC) or vote for the Italian Communist Party (Partito Comunista Italiano; PCI). It was a truly historical and fundamental moment for a six or seven year old like me. I took part in the political campaign with my father and mother; they supported the Christian Democrats. We would campaign in our Fiat Balilla, attend political meetings, attend meetings with other families, and join street protests. We would even attend DC conferences with Spadaro, who was the most influential figure of the party at that time in Abruzzo, while the communists would be outside throwing rocks at the door. My father came from a fascist family but was never a Fascist himself. In fact, he was dismissed from the bank where he worked because he was never submissive; he always believed in democracy, in democratic values. In 1947-1948, he chose the DC because he saw no prospect of freedom in the Soviet world or in the Communist Party of the time. The communication campaign, headed by the United States, likely contributed to painting that world in a negative light and he therefore made a clear choice of side. In the '50s, '60s and '70s, I stayed centre. Maybe Enrico Berlinguer had created a new vision, a new meaning of the left. I would say that it was when Berlinguer was in power that I began to look favourably on the left. Berlinguer highlighted an inconsistency not only within the Communist Party but also in people's opinion of communism. I believe that I was influenced further by the fact that I lived in Ivrea, where there was a bishop called Luigi Bettazzi. He was a remarkable person, full of life, a bishop who had obviously always been on the fringes of hierarchy. In the '70s, he had a sort of official correspondence with Berlinguer himself which appeared in the newspapers. The two exchanged opinions very respectfully and with great mutual understanding; Berlinguer was respectful towards the world of believers and Bettazzi towards the Marxist-Atheist world and the left in general. I believe that living in a town like Ivrea where there was someone like Bettazzi helped change the way the left was perceived by someone like me, someone who had grown up with the image of communists wanting to play ball with your head in the town square, as they had actually stated! It was Catholic-Communism; the meeting of two ideologies which were both centred on mankind as such, one from a Marxist perspective and the other from a Christian perspective. In this sort of summary I saw a major step towards overcoming a number of barriers, misunderstandings and divisions, which I actually believed were anti-historical. On the one hand, the failure of the Historic Compromise was caused by the death of ideologies. On the other, it was due to the seizure of power by boorish liberalism, by an idle society in which there were not any values and people simply just took. This is something that still continues today: taking and running. Illegality, protecting the Mafia, protecting widespread corruption and, in practice, an attack on diligence. This is our society: where survival of the fittest rules. Ours is a society in which those who are pretty, intelligent, rich and cunning matter at the expense of those who are not so pretty, quick, and so on. I believe that the Church also has some responsibility, and this comes from someone like me, a believer and practicing Catholic.

Generally, I have always been aware of the idea of social responsibility, even implemented within companies. This is thanks to my privileged viewpoint, given that I worked at Olivetti all my life, first in the office and then managing the Historical Archive. A fundamental part of our society is in the hands of the businessman: work but also the creativity of the country and the nation. When we talk about the "Olivetti

style", we essentially refer to two aspects. The first is great attention to technology and therefore to development, planning and technological innovation. The second is a moral responsibility towards our country. These are the two fundamental considerations of the Olivetti style and I believe they are also fundamental considerations of so-called company ethics. Priority should be given to the creation of goods, social welfare and wealth. Wealth is something completely different to finance; finance simply makes the adventurer rich so that he can take and run. If a company decides to produce goods in other places, for example in the Far East where labour costs are currently lower, the brains of the company, where the planning and inventing happen, must remain in the country. If not, the country will become impoverished. I believe that impoverishing the country where you, the company, not only came into being but also became successful is robbery, a social crime. In my mind, taking away, stealing (yes, here I use the term stealing) work and development from your country is a social crime. And the problem lies in the classic instrument; that is politics. Politics must deal with everything, not just the potholes in the roads but also union achievements. It cannot linger on the sidelines, washing its hands of matters and making room for wanton liberalism. If, for some reason, an enterprise gradually goes out of business and is driven almost to bankruptcy and into liquidation, the state must carry the bag; it must defend the business's work, achievements, franchise, and know-how otherwise the nation itself will lose power. I refer to the simply phenomenal example of how Olivetti was destroyed; at one point or another, neither the union, nor politics, nor public opinion, nor culture saved or protected this treasure, a treasure not just of Ivrea but of the nation, a treasure of society, and the treasure of those who fought to create something unique in the world. The result is a condition which I generally compare to disappointment, disillusion and obviously also abandonment. That "That's it, I can't take this anymore! Nothing will ever change!" attitude which implies despair, distress and depression. However, I believe that in our everyday lives, in our own small way, we must continue to believe and to "fight". Sitting in front of the television in our slippers and not giving a second thought to society is another social crime which each one of us is guilty of to some extent. I take the liberty to repeat this whenever I meet someone who feels dejected and disappointed. We cannot give up. We must always do something, in our own small way, but always something which opposes abandonment. I personally believe that every time we give up, every time one of us gives up, every time we judge something, every time a cultural initiative is brought to an end either due to a lack of funds or a lack of desire, that space can become occupied by unscrupulous people. It always seemed to me that politics was the only one with the tools to change things. I must add that politics is at the height of charity, if we want to bring the conversation back to Catholic morals or even Christian morals in general. This means that through politics we have the means to restore the balance, to close the gap between the richest and the poorest, and to promote society. Therefore, maybe politics should not be understood as a party-political commitment. Each one of us is a politician because we live in society, in a polis. I believe that I have always based everything I have done on an attempt to act in such a way that my actions, my smallest behaviour were aimed at contributing to the development of society.