

DISINTEGRATION

OF THE SYSTEM

GIORGIO FREDA

Disintegration of The System

Fraca 'Giorgio' Freda

Introduction to the Second Edition

Claudio Mutti

The text published here in French translation was born in Italy, during the year 1969, when the phenomenon of “student dissent” had provoked the illusion of a definitive turn that would intervene in the history of this interminable and stifling post-war era.

Facing the “revolt” of 1968-69, many, in effect, were inclined to believe that mobilization for the destruction of the bourgeois system had commenced; it acted, on the contrary, as a simple – but vociferous – readjustment of the system, thus it is true that in this “revolt” engendered by the insufficiency and failures of the regime, the anarchoid and anti-authoritarian whims that characterize petty bourgeoisie nature took a large part. Of the illusion that we spoke of above, we find no trace in *The Disintegration of the System*, which even affirms the necessity of a radical and absolute subversion; thus it was not a vain optimism that led the author to publish this text, but the deep conviction that everything should be attempted, particularly at the moment where different youth were searching to give a revolutionary content to the student revolts, to avoid its extinction in Marxist reformism or bogging down in the swamp of moderation.

It is to these youth that *The Disintegration of the System* addresses itself, by reiterating, as the natural and normal premise of their action, the principles of the True State.

For the first time, the formulation of the “traditional” doctrine of the State gave rise, under the scheme of operational instructions, to a coherent and intransigent position of refusal of bourgeois “values.”

Those who claimed, hitherto, the “traditional” doctrine of the state, did not leave academic and nostalgic verbiage; in the worst case – and it was not a very rare case – they descended into the domain of political action (or, better, agitation) by enlisting, as poorly paid mercenaries, in the service of the bourgeois rear-guard, utilizing Evolianism as a coarse alibi for “reactionary” choices.

On the contrary, in the formulation of Freda, the doctrine of the True State was understood in the sense of an integral and irreducible opposition to the bourgeois world; the communist organization of the Popular State, that is presented in *The Disintegration* as an alternative to the society of merchants, is only an emergency therapy henceforth indispensable in view of the elimination, of the burial, of homo oeconomicus: at first glance the “homeopathic” remedy for the “restoration of the human” to a virile Rangordnung.

Thus it is necessary to recall the contingencies against which the text was directed: recall the deformed and impudent political applications made by numerous “Evolians” and “traditionalists”: that is indispensable if we want to situate the writing of Freda in its right dimension.

However, the other part, beyond the contingencies and what they had conditioned in the communist-aristocratic utopia of Freda, *The Disintegration* holds an indisputable value, that holds in the fact of “pushing” those who want to engage in the political domain towards positions of radical coherence. We do not demand from them devotion to the “theses” of Freda, but natural reflections of a temperament and style made with clarity, fairness and dry lucidity, deepening – under the plan of existential adherence to its “essential” characteristics – the doctrine of the True State, and the elaboration of a flexible and “disenchanted” strategy of struggle, a strategy turned towards the disintegration of the bourgeois system.

Author's Warning

Speaking of myself – taking myself, consequently, seriously – is something that is only disposed in favor of “bad taste” by he who indulges it. I thus requested that Professor Claudio Mutti, for a brief presentation of the French edition of the booklet, formulate some observations: observations that have above all shed light on real limits. But friends are destined to be indulgent towards their friends... To palliate, consequently, this indulgence of my friend Mutti in this regard, I will thus summarize my position – which applies also as a “warning” for the reader -: in *The Disintegration*, there is nothing original; on the staff, there are only notes and commas; nearly everything there is original ...

Preface

Eric Houllefort

This preface, written for the second Italian edition of *The Disintegration*, wants firstly to be a testimonial and also the proof that the text of Freda, which has henceforth become a sort of “classic” in Italy, has found an echo in France. *The Disintegration*, in this regard, played, with the signing of these lines and others by French “fellow travelers”, the role of revealer: this text has shown them, as clearly as possible, that they had felt confused for many years already, but they were still incapable of transcribing on a new level a coherent and radical political discourse.

It consequently introduces, by showing what are, in the eyes of the French reader who follows it, things close to the same doctrinal and political route of Freda, the principal merits of *The Disintegration*.

The first and greatest merit of this text is to have concretely enunciated the principle according to which, by taking an expression from Evola himself, being “an integral traditionalist” today is the best way to be radically revolutionary. Therein, Freda was the first to not content himself with commenting on Evola, but extracting from the Evolian theory of practice, the practice of the theory, or, to continue to speak like Marx, to pass from a critique of weapons to the weapons of critique. Thus, it has filled in what we are well obliged to call a lacuna in the work of Evola, to know the incapacity of transcribing on a new level of political combat some normative principles is perfectly exposed. After having recognized himself in *Ride the Tiger* the untimeliness of a book like *Men Among the Ruins* (untimely of the sole level of historical application, evidently), Evola had magisterially defined the internal line of struggle of the differentiated man: what we could all an “active nihilism.” But, so curiously, it did not leave to the radical existentialism of this differentiated man another possibility, on the political level, that of fighting on lost positions. Here reappears the ancien regime side of Evola and the mentality of the “last stand,” an exclusively defensive mentality that does not cease to refresh “the cup of bitterness”, from Metternich to the neo-Fascists of today who are still “defending the West.”

On the contrary, the tone of *The Disintegration* is, from the first to the last line, resolutely offensive and that is why we can believe that we can say, without ceding the slightest to the taste of originality, that *The Disintegration* affirms one of these practices – the political practice – of the theory exposed in *Ride the Tiger*. In itself, this text is an example of true fidelity to a work, a fidelity to the spirit and not only the letter, a very authentic and very fertile fidelity like that of certain “Vestals” consecrated to the quasi-priestly defense of a work and a man still foreign to all dogmatism and all ideology. On this subject, the hardest words that Freda has for certain “Evolians”, for “the sterile apologetics of ‘discourse’ on the state”, the “adorers of abstractions and inevitable logic,” the “champions of conceptual testimonials,” are clearly justified. Because when “the average

Evolian” affirms that he has exceeded politics, he can offer no opening to his “existential quest,” that he only gives importance to the Awakening and internal realization, there is the too often the objective game of the system that, by its absolute dictatorship of image and appearance, is very well satisfied by the presence on the right, of a pseudo-aristocratic appeal and, on the left, a pseudo-revolutionary appeal. He does not see that his sole liberty had been reduced to choosing a mannerism; all as his alter ego of the other extreme that said: “that he wants everything, because in reality, hopeless from waiting for the least real goal, he wants nothing more than to know he wants everything, in that hope that someone will suddenly admire his assurance and his beautiful soul. He must have a totality that, like himself, is without content. He ignores the dialectic because, by refusing to see his own life, he refuses to understand the times. The times make him afraid because it makes qualitative leaps, irreversible choices, chances that will never return.”

The second merit of *The Disintegration* is to recall – and with what vigor! – that practically all the ideological infections that presently smother humanity have germinated on the soil of Europe, then were conveyed by the Europeans. It is a reminder of the first importance regarding a milieu, seeing Europe on the bench of the accused, believes itself obligated, by a sort of imbecilic reflex, to systematically exalt all that was born in Europe or, still worse, everyone that has white skin. It is one more time, a typically right wing attitude, just as the defensive and idealist petite bourgeois mentality previously denounced: an attitude that consists of, to utilize graphic but evocative language, of only considering the magnitude but not the direction above all of vector. Thus, we will see for example tomorrow, cohorts of neo-Fascists, with some survivors of the Second World War, go to ride the South African “vector”, because there are still “pure race” whites there or because “well intentioned” recruiting agents made them recall the pro-German past of Vorster (the “magnitude” of the vector); they simply will forget that South Africa is marked, from its origin, by Protestantism- and thus, by mercantilism -and today the Pretoria-Tel Aviv axis functions very effectively (the “direction” of the vector). All the “right” is therein: aestheticism, romanticism, sentimentality: total absence of political conscience. On the plan equally. *The Disintegration* demarcates a salutary rupture.

The third merit of the text of Freda is to bring to light well, in parallel with the exposition of the “physiognomy of the authentic state,” the inorganic property of modern society. The heritage of two thousand years of “Judeo-Christian infection”, thus said Freda, “between the secular domain of the state and the abstract ‘spiritual’ plan,” translated in the individual by an incapacity to live simultaneously, and not alternatively, on many distinct plans. Existence becomes a sequence of foreign moments from one to the other, without any cohesion, that authorizes – it is the most serious here – all separations and all possible compensations, including those who pretend to be declared adversaries of the system. Thus, it is the revolutionary project that becomes a simple exorcism, “vulgar sacralization of the daily routine,” which tends to “edify an independent empire in the clouds of a speculative radicalism.”² By underlining what he cannot have, in every “normal” civilization, any opposition between the realization of the final ends of the state and those of man, Freda indirectly shows that the first need of whoever wants to be a revolutionary militant is to grant himself the most possible vision of the world of which he is the bearer in his own life, under the penalty of falling into ideology. In this domain, Freda himself is an example for all: his absolute refusal of aligning with the mangy dogs of the bourgeoisie press for more than five years now, his contempt for all dubious publicity, are the indisputable proof of his revolutionary coherence and his political conscience. His writings and his attitude confirm, certainly more than the action of certain men of the ultra-left – to whom he made a loyal offer of common struggle and who did not have the good judgment to respond – the accuracy of the lines of Marx, found in *The German*

Ideology: "Individuals are what they manifest in their lives. How they thus coincide with their production, as well as by what they produce and the manner in which they produce it."

The Disintegration also contains another innovative element in relation to Evolian discourse: we want to speak of the advent of the Fourth Estate. Thus for Evola, the Fourth Estate can only lead to its end the involutory processes started by the bourgeoisie long ago, for Freda, whose revolt against all that is bourgeois and the dictatorship of the economy is truly visceral, the Fourth Estate is not the "unnatural spirituality" of the modern world, but rather the possibility of "the restoration of the human," through the emergence of an ascetic and military way of life, the simplification of relations between citizens, in sum the advent of a "new essence," like that predicted by Jünger in *Der Arbeiter*, following the decomposition of the bourgeois world, decomposition beginning from the First World War, when the credos of the 19th century were effaced before the return of elementary energies. In this regard, the sympathy of Freda for Chinese Communism – strongly understandable sympathy, for when we reflect on it a bit – and the communist model for the "organization of the people's state" exposed in *The Disintegration* are emblematic confirmation of the preceding lines. (*)

The future will say that Evola or Freda was right on this point. At least the position of Freda, that is expressed here in the partisan, in the sense of Carl Schmitt, animated by a permanent political conscience, an immediate sense of relation to forces and an intuition capable of seizing the profound reality of a political phenomenon behind the vocabulary of its facade and its coating to pass – at least this position has the merit of inciting struggle and clarifying certain engagements.

There is finally one last point – very important – where *The Disintegration* also affirms itself as a text of rupture: the discourse of Freda is not only an anti-bourgeois discourse, it's also an anti-capitalist discourse. Now these two things are not always together, because one of the characteristics of Fascism is the incapacity to pass from the anti-bourgeois to the anti-capitalist. A young French university student, who came to report by two objective, rigorous, and well documented works this phenomenon regarding Drieu: "The judgment regarding capitalism, by the symmetric theory of the black beast to the red beast, effectively appears strictly moralizing and psychological ('selfishness', 'cupidity') ... In reality, it recovers a real fascination for the ascendant era of "heroic" capitalism and for the captains of industry defined by Drieu himself as 'frightfully beneficent.' The collaborationist, the Fascist, is not anti-capitalist, he is anti-bourgeois."³

With Freda, there is no doubtful nostalgia for capitalism, "heroic" or not; no more little admiration for these "merchants of shock" that are certain colonists or founders of trusts. Here the anti-bourgeois revolt derives from a vision of the world, anterior and superior to anything put in rational form, but not exhausted in the aesthetic sublimation of an anarchism of the right. In the consequent fashion, it gives itself the means to achieve its ends. On this subject, the chapter on "the organization of the people's state" plays, by its radicalism, the role of stumbling block: faced with such a model, we are obligated to take a position – and to show clearly what camp we belong to.

All the qualities enumerated since the beginning (the rupture with neo-Fascist confusion; the definitive abandonment of right wing attitudes; the will to go encounter sectors objectively engaged in the negation of the bourgeois world) make *The Disintegration*, the dawning of the long march of European Revolution, the manifesto of the partisan of the fourth front: the European front, which must open, after the fronts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, to vanquish American-Zionist imperialism, the enemy of man. We have without a doubt not finished speaking of this little booklet...

Part 1

Analysis

“It is inevitable that in this world of exploiters and exploited, no greatness is possible that was not ultimately made with economics. We have two opposed species of man, of arts and morals, but it is not necessary to have very much finesse to perceive that the source that feeds it is unique. It is also of the same type of progress where the protagonists of economic struggle find their justification. They meet in the fundamental pretension of everyone being a true factor of social prosperity, by which everyone is convinced of being able to undermine the positions of the adversary when he succeeds in contesting every right that is presented as such.”

The fundamental reason that lead us to gather this Congress is determined by a profound conviction – mine and yours – that the present moment imposes on our organization the requirement of “closing ranks” around central motifs of our vision of life and the world. The requirement, in the first place, of recognizing what are really the points of reference and the canon from which we derive our political presence, to distinguish the ideal direction to assume. In second place, – or better, consequently and simultaneously – the requirement of articulating in a flexible group, agile, without complexes, without inhibitions – in one word: without prejudice – our vocation, our will of political struggle.

We find ourselves in the moment where the necessity of accounting for our past errors, of understanding the deep reasons that permitted them, cutting through with the need to dive into our roots – “our” roots, that is to say those men who avow a politics without mental reservations, without equivocal intentions, without petite bourgeois alibis, but with, to thus say, the impersonal soul of he who accomplishes his own duty because he must accomplish it – at the center of our political doctrine, and to remain attached to essential things, without hesitation. A lucid adherence to the essential must permit, or later, consolidate our capacity to remain agile and flexible with what is functional and instrumental. I believe in effect that there’s nothing new to say in support, that the more we are rooted at the center, the more we can easily move on the points of the far circumference, without moving away – from what is important, from the essential – of the center.

I said firstly: close ranks, to give life to a flexible political organization. I want to now add: close ranks to possess a political organization able to give a helping hand to the men destined for conquest and power.

We have thus walked along a path until now. We should not fear the consequences of self-criticism when it is free and dignified and that is why we will say: we declined! We rest passively united with “others,” with the political schemes of “others”, with the false problems of “others,” with the ideological claims of “others:” he have recolonized our final ends- that were, at least, equivocally – with “others.” The comportment of all – firstly the leaders, and, then, the partisans – were, in the best hypothesis, naive, in the worst, obtuse.

Our political discourse was focused, from the start, on Europe, and we would believe that Europe was truly a myth and represented an authentic idea-force: while much later we only convinced ourselves that this word reflected a simple geographic definition, with which it was not allowed to have an original propaganda value in an epoch where even the tobacco stores, laundries, snack bars, and the hotels of spa resorts all call themselves “Europe!”

We have spoken of the European political conception opposed to the different nationalist petty patriotic conceptions, but we have never took care (or we never wanted to realize?) that we cannot have value from the

side of the petite bourgeois nationalist right- especially with us – and consequently, all exhausted terms of an “indifferentist” polemic (it has also been surpassed, henceforth, since the neo-fascist kids themselves shout: Europe-Fascism- Revolution!) We have spoken in terms of “European civilization,” without even scratching the surface of this expression and without verifying it, going to the depths of the problem, if there exists, in reality, a homogeneous European civilization and what are the authentic coefficients of its meaning in light of a global historical situation in which the Latin American guerrilla adheres much better to our vision of the world than the Spaniard vassal to priests and the USA (1); where the warrior people of North Vietnam, with a Spartan, sober, heroic style are far closer to our conception of existence than the Italian digestive tract, or the French or German of the West (2); where the Palestinian terrorist is far closer to our dreams of vengeance than the Jewish or Judaized Englishman (European? I doubt it). (3)

We have fought for European hegemony, by addressing ourselves to a Europe that was henceforth Americanized and Sovietized, without considering that this Europe had become the slave of the USA and the USSR, because the European nations and peoples were absorbed – following the military defeat, but not as a consequence of this defeat – into the ideological exports of the USA and the USSR. Without considering that the political, economic, cultural collapse had intervened exactly because having ended this tension, it had collapsed, this support that had aroused in some peoples, among some European men, in certain historical epochs (only among some men in some determined historical epochs!), this superior dimension of civilization that we pretended to attribute to Europe without qualification.

The moment has come to end with entertaining ourselves with the puppet “Europe” and chanting its name.

We have nothing to do with the Illuminist Europe. We have nothing to see with the mercantile Europe, with the Europe of plutocratic colonialism: nothing to share. We only have accounts to settle with the Jewish or Judaized Europe.

However, when we speak in terms of “European civilization,” we consider all that: do not tell me that we speak also of that: we speak, unfortunately, only of that! Or, maybe, we want to see something else?

However. If we do not want to see another thing, of this “other” until now, we have never really and completely spoken. And I am sure that if we had truly considered and possessed this “other,” we would not have provided this content a container or, better an etiquette, or still better, a “brand name” represented by the word “EUROPE.”

Having grown such and such impure compositions, to push back, to bury; have intervened such – I dare say: too many – factors that have altered and corrupted this European liquid to the point of making it manure, it can still positively undergo processes of separation. Europe is an old hussy who has whored in all the brothels and has contracted all the ideological infections – since those of revolts of medieval communes to those of anti-imperial national monarchies; from Illuminism to Jacobinism, to Masonry, to Judaism, to Zionism, to liberalism, to Marxism. A whore, whose womb has conceived and engendered the bourgeois revolution and the proletarian revolt: whose soul was possessed by the violence of merchants and the rebellion of slaves. And us, right now, we would like to redeem it, by whispering the magic words: by saying, for example, that we must give to the “Europeans” exclusively ... from Brest to Bucharest?! (4)

We have raised the flag of Europe without being able to stand for any viable and homogeneous meaning: without seeing the number of its sons and the knots that compose its torn tissue and how much excrement it hides!

We preferred, in summation, to hide our incapacity to choose what that was authentic and true to us and to know to reject what is impure and equivocal there within the European tradition (that is to say, in this case, historically), by having the illusion of filling in such a void by recourse to the formula, the word "Europe"; without considering, as I said at the start, that it is a democratic bourgeois or democratic socialist Europe; all as existed yesterday a Fascist or Nazi Europe; all as existed before yesterday a Jacobin and Counter-Revolutionary Europe. Without considering that many people, including the technocrats of the ECC, dream of a Europe in their manner: a Europe founded on a sinister hierarchy that imposed at the base of the pyramid the "rational" exploitation of Italian labor, and, at the summit, the investment of international capital.

In place of adopting this equivocal formula (which should only serve to distinguish us from those who support other formulas – the nationalist formulas – all as equivocal), it was necessary to say by name what principles, around what vision of the world, according to what direction of effectiveness, the best of the European men should engage in a "supernational organic political unity." That is this other reality that we could still give the name "Europe.", if the "old Europe," the Europe of obscure centuries (to reverse the meaning of a phrase known by an old clown), the Europe of anti-imperial communes, the Europe of the Roman Church, the Protestant Europe, of mercantilism, of Illuminism, of proletarian and bourgeois democracy, the Judaic and Masonic Europe, if this monstrous specter was never presented before these men of a very different race.

I am stopping myself on this point, because it represents the most evident character of our errors and because the motif of Europe constituted, in the years of political activity of our organization, the focal point towards which our political perspectives flowed. I thus hold it useless to stop to specifically consider the other elements of our program, from the moment that they also have consequences, on the distinct plans, of these equivocations already mentioned.

Now, after having recognized our myopia and our errors, it is necessary to proceed, before verifying the direction to assume, to analyze the situation today and the operational criteria that follow the others. I continue to say "the others" – and not our adversaries or our enemies – exactly because they want to insist and clarify up to the most extreme representations that words can create or images evoke, how much between us and the others there is (and there should be) much more than simple difference of mentality, the fashion of acting, political ideology. It is a different soul, it is another race that gives our actions their typical meaning and gives them a proper physiognomy, irreducible to figures and the common terms of different political ideologies of our epoch.

The consideration that we leave is this: we live today in a world of others, surrounded by others, by these dignified representatives of the bourgeois epoch, under the domination of the most miserable and most demeaning of dictatorships: the bourgeois dictatorship, that of the merchants. All that surrounds us is bourgeois: political society, economics, culture, family, social mannerisms, religious manifestations.

In "Western" democracies, the spectacle presented to us is linked by a revolting coherence to the most orthodox canons of the bourgeois conception of life. In these democracies, the state is used to maintain stability, by the intermediary of all its repressive and oppressive instruments, the hegemonic relation of a class – the class of the bourgeoisie and, particularly, a part of that, the part that constitutes a plutocratic oligarchy –

on the people. The exclusively classist support on which it is based does not admit realities and values other than economic realities and values: the bourgeois dictatorship victoriously emerging according to processes of reinforcement and hegemonic intensification since the French Revolution (*), now unalterable for about one hundred years the only relation that links the bourgeoisie to man: the relation of master to slave, exploiter to exploited. Despite all the sweeteners of assistance, of foresight, in general paternalism, here is the reality of the bourgeois regime.

This is even the reality that Marx, in 1849 already, described magisterially in the Communist Manifesto: “The political power of today of the modern state is only an administrative junta of common businesses of the entire bourgeois class ... Everywhere where it has come to domination, it destroyed all those conditions of life, that were feudal, patriarchal, idyllic. It destroyed without pity all those multicolored links, which in the feudal regime brought men closer to their natural superiors, and only left between man and other men those links of immediate self interest and the merciless payment of accounts... It transformed personal dignity into a simple value of exchange; and to the numerous and different liberties well acquired and consecrated by documents, it substituted the sole and unique liberty of commerce, with a hard and pitiless conscience.”

If bourgeois society (***) concedes to the dominated (to the subjugated!) an amelioration of conditions of vegetative life (by including here even those of the mental domain!), that is not the exclusive selfish-economic premises on which it is founded that came to be missed. He usually say exactly that the “devil” is all the more dangerous when he becomes more respectable! And, in effect, the greatest well being should have consequently made in the historical development of bourgeois society, the tendencies of political hegemony of a part of the bourgeoisie, consolidated in a politically effective “abuse of power,” simply assume different modes of force than the preceding ruling classes, and the expressions in its coherent manifestations are of the same identical reality: reality enclosed, exactly, in the schemes of production – consumption tension.

The capitalist, thus understands that by raising the salary of the worker, the latter will buy a fridge or an automobile produced by the capitalist; the boss realizes that by stunning those who work with the obsession of always needing new things– and for the same unreal, illusory, artificial – and constraining him by the preoccupation of acquiring them, he can completely intoxicate the worker with work. Thus the latter, gentle and happy, tranquil as a cow (a cow that, periodically, can roar for salary claims; which, sometimes, can even give the illusion of being a wild bull and can damage the stable!), undertakes no attempt to substitute its own hegemony for that of the bourgeoisie.

Consequently, the state of bourgeois “representative” democracies is only the political forum of the bourgeoisie; its unique function and real destination are determined by the bourgeois economy, in the sublimation of the bourgeois economy. Aided by the means of penetration that technical applications of bourgeois science offer, the bourgeoisie, after having reduced man to the level of the worker, succeeded in completing the process of cross-identification of the “individual” and the “social” and filling each domain with its presence. The merchant imposed on all his own inclinations, his own aspirations: different, foreign (we do not say superior, only different) vocations possessing no margin in the political space of the bourgeoisie, that belongs solely to he who is “bourgeois.”

Art itself, despite the hypocritical justification (or dignification?) of the schemes of autonomy that the bourgeois care to attribute to it, is rigorously used for the pleasure (or better, for intellectual masturbation) of the bourgeois (5). “Free” science is only another thing that researches for the progress of the bourgeois civilization,

that is to say the reinforcement of bourgeois society: it is only an effective technology serving the “conquests” of bourgeois civilization.

Justice itself is only another crystallization into the law codes of the ideas that dominate within bourgeois society, ideas of the “arrogant” class that is the bourgeois class. Any wrong note, any dysfunction of the system is attributed by it to sabotage committed by enemies of the system, by the rare men for whom the order simply is not an idol to adore, for whom the legalistic sublimation only represents profound and demeaning injustice.

When by chance, finally, all these coefficients of equilibrium do not suffice, bourgeois society puts in function its principal and decisive safety valve, sports, phenomena of mass transference, of deviance, exhausting the remaining energy towards a still exciting, near demonic objective (7).

Besides that, if the economy is the destiny of the bourgeoisie, it is, in the same fashion, the destiny of the poor, that is to say, the exploited, meaning, the proletariat.

It is not even from another reality, or a different fetish, that the proletarians begin the assault from the bourgeois refectory. It is the raging conscience of not wanting to serve the bourgeoisie any longer, not wanting to fatten their fortunes, that provokes the proletarian revolt (8).

If the bourgeoisie recite the “leitmotiv” of equality, as a juridical – cultural – sentimental concept, the proletarians do not content themselves with “good intentions,” but require that the formula, by becoming a means of concrete action, eliminates the distinction between he who has and he who has not, or between those who possess more and those who possess less. However, the economic and quantitative premises remain! It is always in the name of economic reality, it is always under the effects of the mystic delirium of the economy that the proletariat tends to impose its articulation of economic relations, its organization of justice, its fashion of conceiving – by way of consequences – artistic production, relations between citizens, etc ...

The apparent antithesis between bourgeois democracies and socialist (*) democracies dissolves – like a wall of ice – in the face of this characteristic dominance of production and consumption.

Priority which, in bourgeois democracies, is represented by he who has economic power and, consequently, political power (he who possess, commands), is constituted in socialist democracies by he who has political power and has, consequently, at his disposal – as a unique privilege of his politically commanding function – these same means of production that, in the so-called “opposing” camp, form the property of the bourgeoisie.

On one side, the holders of capital, who possess – in the name of liberty, justice, order – the political power and aim to keep it, that is to say to increase it to increase their capital; on the other, the sole holders of capital, who, by using different branding, advertise the same product. The economic structure of the abnormal processes of production-consumption are thus present in the two cases (*).

It is not the moment to analyze – even briefly- the imperialist implications of these systems, whose logic necessarily poses, exactly, the solution of an imperialist assault as a means of protection, unique and fatal, of the capitalist system.

It is thus not astonishing if, like all in bourgeois society, in socialist society as well, the functions of power are qualified and expressed exclusively in terms of wealth; could it be anything else when we attribute to the state the sole function of counter of wealth (besides, what different state could the bourgeois and socialist

themselves better establish?): when the function of the state is aroused by wealth, to seize wealth and to propose exclusively the satisfaction of the physical needs of vegetative existence (inevitably also, we will repeat, in the term “physical,” these disturbing complications that the bourgeoisie satisfy themselves to designate as “spiritual” needs).

In the two models, consequently, the identical phenomena only admit, by alternation, “blurred images.” Tension opposing the bourgeoisie and proletarians on one part, tension opposing the bureaucrats (technocrat functionaries) to the governed on the part.

On one side, private property is not included in the state (that is to say that it is not limited to represent one of the organizing coefficients of the state), but is the state itself, the state is the “property of the propertied”; on the other, the property of the state resolves itself in the property of those who administer the state, so well that the state and abstract equality resolve in a bureaucratic and technocratic prevarication.

At this point, it would be ridiculous to oppose to this analysis the subtle “distinction” according to which an identity regarding the form of results between the two forms of organization – the bourgeois and the socialist – would not correspond to a substantial identity in the form of “principles.” According to which, while the exploiter-exploited relation would be the typical and normal consequence, necessarily deriving from the premises of the bourgeois capitalist system, the exploitation of the governed by the government in the socialist capitalist system should be qualified by abnormal dysfunction and degeneration not imputable to the essence of the same system (9)! The truth, on the contrary, is that the essence of the two phenomena is the same, because the principles are the same: economy is the destiny of man, the unique elemental reality- the essential – of man, his sole existential dimension. And this “primordial reality,” having at its center the eternal image of the digestive tract (a tube with two openings: one to swallow and another to evacuate, other eventual openings only serve to embellish it or facilitate “good digestion” and the stimulate gastric secretions, when that is necessary) admits, however, two different interpretations of voracity: one, according to which all digestive tracts are equal (*); the other, according to which all the guts are not equal, but some fat and others very narrow (and that is why it is necessary that justice, order, etc, etc ... ensure that a dangerous and subversive “expansion” does not happen). (**)

Part 2

The Physiognomy of the Authentic State

“One day the workers will live like the bourgeoisie but below them, poorer and more simply, there will be a superior caste. That is who will possess power.”

There is still, however, those who do not allow themselves to be possessed by the seductions of the economy and remain firm in the conviction that the primordial task of the state is not to guarantee the acquisition or the maintenance of a fridge, of a washing machine, or greater weekly hobbies. There are those who are convinced, because he believes that the goal of man is not the maintain himself, vegetate, and satisfy himself, that it is another thing: that it is even exactly this other thing that gives meaning and style to existence, and that, precisely from this other thing, it's worth the effort of deproletarianizing himself and de-bourgeoisifying himself, by exhausting the framework of conditioning determined by the existence of physical needs in the parts and the least important regions of the human being.

It is to this truly free race of men – to the ascetics, in the classic sense of the term, of politics – that we propose a dialogue around the true state and the function of the free and just man in the state: with the intention not of presenting a vague and sentimental entity, but orienting towards the subtle intuition of the myth -and even the mystery – of the state.

We do not search for the state on the basis of empirical inquiry leading to the phenomena of the state existing today; we will attempt to seize the state not as a historical phenomenon – the State hic et nunc – from a “phenomenological” point of view, but we want to understand it in the absolute: as a value, that is to say, as reality that holds true pro aeternitate. A reality that, considering in itself, has no need of manifestation, historical support (the existing state), to be valuable. In other terms, we want to seize the essence of the idea of the state that illuminates, judging if these phenomena (the historical states) are better or worse applications in relation to this canon.

The indications that follow do not derive from our personal ideology (by admitting that we have one), they convince us that we have the rigorous truth according to which “ an idea cannot be new, because the truth is not a product of the human spirit, but it exists independently of us and all that we have ever known.”

Taking what we have said higher, our myth of the state is not held to be a utopia, if by utopia we mean, in effect, that which cannot be realized or exist, the fruit of overly cerebral and intellectual conception.

The myth of the state is the myth of a political order that, without lower itself to any particular time and space, “is” eternal, and eternally proposed as true.*

The principles of the true state, by recovering the domain of “should be”, assume an eminently normative character and, as such, are not verified by recognition or agreement, by the decided refusal of those who live in the historical world. They issue from a metapolitical and metahistorical level consequently autonomous in relation to the forms of empirical political existence: it is on the contrary these forms which, in order not become abstractions, are “forms of something “real,” and should exist by function of these principles.

The meaning of the true state depends on the animating tension that it inspires in the individual microcosm, such that he represents a real center of power and not an inert superstructure. The true state does not propose as its authentic goal economic wealth and well being for all its citizens or a lone social group, but what the ancient Greeks lucidly defined in terms of “felicity” – eudaimonia – of harmony of the different components of the body of the state. “Felicity” in the sense of accomplishment, integration, and participation with the superhuman and divine elements of reality.

In the true state there must be the guarantee of organic unity of the social body, unity that must not be understood as intrusion of the state into the pretend domain of the private interests of the citizen, but as the constitution of a climate of ideal social tension, where each is abiding at his post, following his own inclinations with coherence, fidelity, and liberty. Thus it is not admissible, in this state, that someone commits prevarications and abuses, which amounts to injuring others: on the contrary, it must maintain a will lucid and conscious of following an existence conforming to its proper nature.

Evidently, when we attribute to the state (or better, when we recognize in the state) the function of fostering this climate that, alone, makes possible a regime of ordered life, we do not want to consider the state as a means of activity generating “virtue” – in the modern and moralistic meaning of the term-as a pure element

“functioning” in the soul of man. The true state, on the contrary, must be understood as a reality in contact with all that we propose, in a conditioned fashion, as individual morality, objective, settling into these terms a free ethic of these characters of “virtue” that we attribute today to morality.

The true state is not the fruit of an ideology or an individual political conception, but the responsible realization in terms of the political regime of an impersonal principle, of a norm that we could define “a priori,” leading – as we exactly had said – to this “natural right of heroic races,” where the signification of nature does not end with the functional, physical element, but acquires value by the “normative” word, symbol of all “normal” and integrated conditions of existence. A canon that represents the “internal dressing”, the absolute formula of a lifestyle accomplished with fidelity to that what it really is.

The true state do not constitute a simple structure of positive rights, but is in essence and in function superior: the spirit of the state, the center of the state is represented by a power that transcends the plan that is immediately earthly and simply human.

The true state holds as an organizing principle of a reconquest that man must do: the reconquest of the higher-world, the reestablishment of his heroic dimension. Consequently, the true state represents the necessary element of mediation that provokes the reintegration of the citizen into divine reality: it is only through its intermediary that the citizen realizes exceeding his own individual existence, by opening a reality that, such as it is autonomous, transcends it.

We do not say that this image of the political regime, developed in a final and coherent fashion, can receive the accusation of usurping “religious” qualities and dimensions, by obligating man – who feels this tension towards the divine – to deviate from his own direction – that would be, according to the accusation, the religious direction – to orient him towards the secular direction, indicated by the state (that state, consequently, would constitute the substitute of functions, that legitimately, would not devolve to it.)

The response to the accusation emerges in the clear fashion of the same terms in which it is formulated, deformed: it comes from making a quasi-ontological rupture – the we should refuse in a decided way – between the said secular domain of the state and the abstract “spiritual” plan, made autonomous in relation to the first. A rupture by which the intrinsic divine values of the human condition, would become simple moral elements, shadowed in the equivocation of the “world of conscience,” while the human elements, unbound from these divine potentialities, would only become profane and secular.

No gap, on the contrary, should exist between the order of values and the plan of the true state (*), because if we make one a stranger to the other, we break an organically unitary reality: we arrive only at the decomposed results of internalizing, in the emotive and moralist style, in a pretend “human conscience,” in values, and we subtract from the public order these characteristics that can only qualify it and legitimize it.

In the true state we cannot objectively pose terms of the priority of the individual in relation to the state or consider, on the other hand, it on him, because the reality of the true state is not separated from the reality of the individual by no difference of structure (more than two realities, we should speak of two coefficients of a unique reality, the two aspects of the same phenomenon, unresolved in substantial continuity). Subsisting solely between them a functional difference of possibility, intensity, given that the state represents the center of “necessary” tension for the citizen to become “happy.”

On the other hand, in the true state there are no longer “individuals”, but men-members of the state; men animated by an ethic of super-personal life, each differentiated by the responsibility of various ranks, a distinct responsibility, a different duty, a degree of various liberty according to organic articulations. These men are engaged as the object of the work of the state and their perfection is the ends to which the order of the state is destined. Only that qualifies the existence of man in the state; only that, in an analogous fashion, constitutes the legitimization of the state that must cultivate, sustain, and support the dispositions of those who are bound to it.

Thus, only in the true state, men participate in the destiny of the state and acquire its power, that is a non human force. They feel its signification, that is supernatural; they nourish themselves in its reality, that is a superior reality. We repeat: it is the true state that determines the direction to follow and “ordains” the moments across which man attains his “authentic” goal, that consists of participation in the divine.

In addition, it is the true state that proposes to each man the recognition of his own irreducible function, of his proper place, of his proper nature, the insertion into the just relations of superiority and inferiority: in a word, the recognition of its proper freedom. And that is not negative liberty that manifests itself externally, liberty turned towards utility and “particularity,” that is to say the only liberty that we can conceive today and that, resolving in undifferentiated and egalitarian terms, develops according to the directions of rebellion. But it is a qualitative and differentiated freedom, typical of the person whose value is inherent. Freedom that does not derive, as we said, from abstract facts and simply being elementary man, but that is measured by the stature, by the dignity of each. That is capable of realizing its own possibilities and adhering to its own particular perfection on the interior of the political framework of the state. Ultimately, freedom that means internal discipline and respect of its own qualitatively hierarchical plan.

After these indications we would like to conclude, and in concluding, reaffirm the idea of the state, these processes that tend to penetrate the mystery of the state, cannot unfold according to simply logical values, but by the intermediary of lucid reference to metaphysical values, inherent in the essence of the idea of the state, to its core not belonging to the domain of things subjected to the bonds of becoming.

To reaffirm the reality of that which is sacred and divine and the sacrality of that which is the real political structure should constitute the support of the true state: because if a state, if a political regime is not legitimized by the fact of possessing a spiritual force, by proposing spiritual ends, it represents nothing organic and central: but will only be an inert, materialist, and social structure, resulting from its own rigidity to all organisms without vital forces.

Part 3

The Necessity of an Operative Method

“Class is only a bourgeois category: in the attempt to conceive by classist means working revolutionary requirements, we indicate an expediency that the bourgeoisie have used in seeking to postpone, in the world and in the social framework of society, the representations of a new humanity, by a regime of transactions, compromises, and negotiations.”

Now, after having traced – by taking its elementary lines- the physiognomy of the true state, we should consider what political work is imposed on us in order to actively testify to our adherence to the image of the true state.

It is not acceptable, even partially, to hold the hypothesis of those who, by cultivating this image (“the model fixed in the heavens” said Plato) in a solely rational fashion, support the necessity of remaining attached to looking at the collapse of the associative forms (that, more effectively, we could call them formula) that are expressed in today’s political reality. For them, effectively, the myth of the state becomes a utopia – contemplated in an overly intellectual fashion – : for them, detachment truly represents the alibi destined to mask uncertainty, incapacity, and fear.

For the sterile apologists of “discourse” on the state, in fact, all action in political terms would be nearly a fall in rank, a descent towards compromise...: they have no idea of the state, but at most, a concept of the state, well hidden in their mental folds. Consequently, we do not take into consideration these adorers of abstractions and the logic of the inevitable, these champions of intellectual testimonials! For us, to be faithful to our vision of the world – and thus the state – means to conform to it, leaving nothing untouched to realize it historically: and certainly not to manifest ideological devotion and contentment with this cerebral coherence.

And then, by developing this premise, we should affirm the condition – not sufficient, however, necessary – in order to pose the elements of the foundation of the true state, the SUBVERSION of all that exists today as a political system.

It is necessary by promoting, goading, accelerating the time of this destruction, intensifying the action of rupture from the present equilibrium and today’s phase of political arrangement. It is necessary to watch for those eventual means, the potential forces that should determine the short circuiting of the nervous centers of this bourgeois civilization not absorbed or integrated by one of the so numerous possibilities of ossification offered by the bourgeois system.

Consequently, we should inevitably transfer our considerations from the plan of recognizing principles to the operative plan: from the plan of what is valuable to the plan of what is effective, to adjust the miserable “reality” (that we should more exactly qualify as “unreality”) of the historical period where we live to the authentic “reality.”

The march to follow (we repeat it here) must be this: rigid firmness in the essential and maximum flexibility in the functional plan.

We have indicated above what we should, according to us, hold as essential. We have already considered the necessity of discovering a plan to hold solidly and a style that we must cultivate. We have already supported the principle by which our political action must essentially develop from and articulate to the men of tendencies, vocations, and characters close to ours: people who have the same ideas of the state as us. At present, in the coalition of men – that we cannot create, but that we can only recognize and strengthen – we have chosen to struggle in the world of bourgeois democracies, to these men that refuse as foreign to their style an equivocal function of intellectual “devotion”, for us, we must propose to these men a definitive objective of struggle: the destruction of the bourgeois world. That is to say we must convince them that they are poorly represented by incurably bourgeois society: that no therapy is possible, that henceforth a surgical operation would not even be effective, that it is necessary to accelerate the hemorrhaging and bury the corpse. We must persuade them that nothing we can construct wouldn’t go to ruins; that the fundamental premise to construct the true state is the demolition of the residual forms and surviving structures of the bourgeois regimes.

There will be, certainly, the fearful, the artless, and the incapable, those who demand guarantees “after the fact”, to the control of successive reactions to the disappearance of bourgeois regimes. Those who, fearing the leap into the fog (and by holding, evidently, the possession of true light) believe it possible to use the glue to reattach and prolong it, in one manner or another, with the aid of vague correctives.

To those we must respond that it is not the moment to ask how to maintain the discourse “of afterwards” The discourse of “afterwards” is presented as real in the measure where we can predict a rigorous method for afterwards, without allowing seduction by messianic solutions. And the discourse on the method afterwards must be traced solely in reference to concrete situations that will appear, that is to say on historical hypotheses. He who is persuaded – and it is a visceral conviction! – that the destruction of bourgeois society forcibly implies the foundation of the proletarian state (or better associative forms different than it), can only earn the recognition suitable for idiots and the superficial. He who realizes, without being conscious of being it, is complicit with the forces that pretend today to perpetuate the bourgeois equilibrium; without wanting to understand, exactly, how the hegemonic bourgeois equilibrium had only two centuries of life and how clear the symptoms are that demonstrate it has entered into a twilight phase and that it is in the process of exhausting its own ability to endure.

However, it is not towards them, but towards the other companions on the route that we turn our attention: towards those who have perfectly grasped that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are both results – or better, dross – of a unique process begun with the decomposition of the organic state; that both represent the faces of the same coin; that both constitute interdependent realities. Thus they have drawn the conclusion that the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are necessary terms, one facing the other, of the internal relation which is assured by the equilibrium of this society. That neither of the two terms can survive disassociated from the other. That the “social question” appeared then as the bourgeoisie – becoming a class in the proper sense of the term – constituted its own dictatorship. The ancient world and the forms of organization of the state that were born in that epoch were experienced by the rich and the poor: but both recognized the dignity of men; while modern societies and times only know exploiters and exploited: and have imposed the slavery of money on both.

It is tiring to repeat, but if this repetition can suit the ends of explanation, we repeat: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are elements integrated into one another; that one appeals to the other; only the difference of qualitative order separates one from the other. And us, if from one side we refuse to distill the sweat of those who work to sublimate them and produce the smoke of incense, we do not want to support and exalt the glands that secrete this sweat any longer.

The solutions that we intend to propose concern the method to adopt will be outlined in the following part. They are limited, voluntarily, to determining the elements of organization of the state, that is to say to consider the reality of the state in one of its moments : that of the regimentation of the elementary relations of life between the citizens.

Between the orientations that follow and the preceding indications, representatives of what we have defined as the reality of the true state, maintain an organic coherence, even if it seems paradoxical the fact that we want to adopt an order that is thus called communist and simultaneously, supporting the value of the organic state and hierarchical order. It is profoundly true, on the contrary, the hierarchy does not mean oligarchy at all; that the organic state does not mean liberty for the bourgeoisie and exploitation for the proletarian; for those who

understood well, order is not determined by the equilibrium of consumption offered by the bourgeois system. It is above all true that the two last centuries of bourgeois dictatorship have made us understand how much the desire for material wealth, the impulsion to hegemony based on the wealth of goods, have been factors of unsupportable aberrations, alienating situations, demeaning suffering by the men of the latter centuries.

Previously, we declared that we intend to propose orientations that serve to define the structures of the state in its moments or goals: those that aim to harmonize the economic relations between the citizens and order the sphere of their "socialization" (judicial, educational relations etc...). Besides that, the fact is that we want to consider an objective that is not certainly the first among those proper to the state but that only justifies itself in instrumental terms in relation to dominant ends (*): this fact, exactly, demonstrates insupportable character of the accusation of ideological syncretism, that reproaches the acceptance of the egalitarian premises and the typical collectivism of socialist democracies. Or better, it is truly necessary to explain that the fact to assume communist criteria in the domain of material goods does not mean at all adherence to the conditions of Marxist socialism?

Material wealth- all material wealth – must be property of the state because it serves the state in its moment of organization; because the state must be unbound from these preoccupations, it is necessary to guarantee it space free from these prevarications that the retention of wealth in the hands of an oligarchical group with economic power inevitably causes.

Part 4

The Organization of the Popular State

"The important thing is not that a new class comes to power, but a new humanity, at the same level of all the other figures of history, fulfilled according to the typical meaning of the space of power. For that, we have refused to see the worker as the representative of a new class, of a new "society", or a new economy. Or the worker is nothing, or something more than all that: the representative of a determinant figure, which acts according to its own laws, follows its own vocation, participates in a particular freedom...

The life of the worker will be autonomous, the direct expression of its being, and consequently, sovereignty, or better it will have nothing other than the effort of ensuring the departure of the camp of old rights and insipid pleasures of an extinguished era."

For the organization of the popular state, the elimination of private property under all its forms will be necessary, the sole exceptions being represented by individual consumable goods.

Property should only be public and particular goods will become part of the patrimony of the state.

In the domain of industrial production, the extinction of particular private enterprises will be followed by the appearance of concentrations of enterprises, differentiated on the territorial level, according to the objectives of production.

In each enterprise the COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT will function, formed by all the workers of the enterprise. The committee of management will periodically name the COMMISSAR OF THE ENTERPRISE, with the function (duties and powers) of coordinating all activity of the enterprise.

The Commissar of the Enterprise will be responsible for his acts before the Regional Committee of Management and Organization (the regional presidium).

In the domain of agricultural production, the dissolution of small and large landowners existing today, will be succeeded by the organic constitution of AGRICULTURAL COMBINES, territoriality differentiated according to the requirements of production.

The workers of the soil will constitute THE COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT OF THE COMBINE. This enterprise will name the COMMISSAR OF THE COMBINE, with analogous functions to those of the commissar of the enterprise.

In the field left free by that which is today is defined as the “activity of commerce,” CENTERS OF CONSUMPTION will be formed, territoriality articulated in the fashion of representing a link between each industrial and agricultural unit and the beneficiaries of these consumer products.

The functioning of this organ will be made possible by the application of criteria analogous to those indicated for the structure of the industrial enterprise and the agricultural combine.

The operative units represented by Industrial Enterprises, Agricultural Combines, and Centers of Consumption, articulated in organic territorial units, will converge – on the level of each region – in the REGIONAL PRESIDUM, the organ that should coordinate the different activities and guarantee the functional equilibrium of the regional unit.

At the national level the POLITICAL PRESIDUM OF THE STATE will function, whose members will be chosen by the different regional presidia.

Periodically the Political Presidium of the State will chose the REGENT OF THE STATE. He will exercise his own functions by coordinating the activities of STATE COMMISSARS (officials of industry, agriculture, consumption, financial affairs, popular education, foreign affairs, popular justice, the popular militia).

The Commissars of the State, chosen by the Regent of the State from those who will be proposed by the Presidium of the State, will have the tasks of surveillance and collaboration with the Commissars of Enterprise, Combines, and Consumption in each minor territorial unit and with the members of each Regional Presidium.

The political economy of the popular state will be guided by criteria essentially opposed to those in force in the present economies of the capitalist type (market economies). Today’s relation of production-consumption (whose expansionist and pathological character of production arouses and exasperates consumption) will be completely overturned, with the attribution of the preeminent function to the PROGRAM OF THE GOODS OF CONSUMPTION in relation to production.

The same relation – made objectively more flexible and functional by consideration of the objective to attain – is valued as a reference for the use of exchanges with foreigners.

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS. The total of banking institutions – today in force in the economies of the capitalist type – will be eliminated.

A STATE BANK will be constituted – under the direction of the State Commissar for financial affairs – with the task of guaranteeing the functional equilibrium of the Popular State’s economy in each sector of production,

consumption, and foreign exchange (it is evident that the function assumed by the State Bank takes no character of credit lending).

The State Bank will coin the money of the state, whose power to purchase will be exclusively guaranteed by the economic wealth of the Popular State.

POPULAR EDUCATION. It is necessary to say first that this expression does not represent – in the most absolute fashion – the humanist – classist – scientific character that has infected the education in force in the countries where the bourgeoisie class dominates.

Today's Italian scholarly structure will be destroyed without reserve nor exception. Academic titles will be abolished.

The constant and rigid criteria of the direction which the Popular State should adhere to in this domain of activity can be summarized by the following formula: "SCHOOL as PREPARATION for WORK." Once the humanist and scientific superstructures are eliminated, school will be rigorously functional, so that scholarly formation will be subordinated to the productive requirements of the Popular State.

In the popular state there will be no place for the abstract and intellectualist culture of the bourgeoisie type. The school, consequently, should take a differentiated and flexible structure, in the fashion of immediately and adequately reacting to the impulses that the Popular State excites in it.

Once the unitary and common to all courses of study are ended, there will be no permission of a particular student to "choose" – arbitrarily and selfishly – the types of study that please him. It will be, on the contrary, the Popular State that determines, in relation to the economic equilibrium of the state, what "operative notions" should be known by the student-member of the Popular State.

In a reduced measure, the family will be charged by the Popular State to accomplish the tasks of education towards the young members of the Popular State.

The constitution of "Houses of the Youth" for the youth of 8 to 20 years, complementary to operative territorial economic units (industrial enterprises, combines, centers) and the functioning of similar institutes for the members of the Popular State less than 8 will be determinant to organically obtain this objective.

The births of the young members of the Popular State will be rigorously planned in relation to the functional equilibrium of the Popular State.

POPULAR JUSTICE: The abolition of private property will provoke the disappearance of those forms of regimentation of individual relations summarized in what the bourgeoisie call "private law."

The administration of justice – concretely deferred to its function of making administrative order – will be exclusively directed towards the punishment of crimes committed against the Popular Order of the State, under all their manifestations (crimes committed against public property; against the popular constitution of the state; against the equilibrium of individual relations).

Today's structure and composition of the Magistracy will be abolished. Popular justice will be exercised – on the sole level of jurisdiction – by a POPULAR JUDGE designated, for each minor territorial unit, – by the Regional

Presidium among those chosen by the Commissars of Enterprises, Combines, and Centers of Consumption, following their proposition by the Committees of Management concerned.

The Popular Judge will be aided by a lawyer, named by the State Commissar for Popular Justice, expert in matters of criminal law, and he will be responsible of his function before the Committees of Management and the Regional Presidium. He will obligate each member of the Popular State to report the cases and circumstances in which a Popular Judge has committed crimes in the administration of Popular Justice.

In exceptional circumstances, recourse to the Regent of the State will be permitted. No act- even one not expressly stated – of an injurious, and thus, criminal, nature to the popular order of the state will escape punishment.

Penalties will consist of forced labor; for the most grave crimes against the popular order of the state and public property, the death penalty will be expected.

The responsibility of different Committees of Management and various Commissars of Enterprise is strictly inherent in the duty of surveillance and prevention, so that those who share in their productive unit do not commit crimes. Consequently, we inflict proportional penalties on all the members of a group where a member commits crimes against the Popular State.

This principle of action provides, in a coherent fashion, structure to the Popular State, which doesn't recognize any individually autonomous reality, but only bodies or productive units within which the individual is constitutionality placed.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: The denunciation of the Atlantic Pact and its military organization, as the rupture of relations that link Italy today the neocapitalist structures (European Economic Community, etc...) must provoke the active insertion of the Popular State into the sphere of states that refuse to be snagged by the politics of imperialist blocs of power.

The Popular State will establish alliances with all the authentically anti-capitalist states and favor on the international level, movements of struggle against capitalism and the revisionist accomplices.

POPULAR MILITIA: In the place of the different organs in the service of the bourgeois state (police, gendarmes, army, etc...) the POPULAR MILITIA will be constituted, organically and exclusively composed of volunteers, rigorously selected for various functions.

The Popular Militia are given the tasks of surveillance and prevention – internally- against the rebirth of bourgeois tendencies, having, externally, the functions of defense for the Popular State and collaboration with movements of anti-capitalist struggle.

Each territorial unit of the Popular Militia will be coordinated by a Commissar of the Militia, named by the Regional Presidium and responsible to the COMMITTEE OF THE MILITIA (composed by all the militia members of the territorial unit) and the Regional Presidium, for the accomplishment of its functions.

Part 5

Conclusions

“The worst evil in Italy, it’s still the bourgeois: the bourgeois-priest, the bourgeois-peasant, the bourgeois-worker, the bourgeois- “mister”, the bourgeois-intellectual: almost sawdust, the substance without form, in which we can distinguish neither high nor low.”

Now that our discourse has touched its end, it is opportune to add what is not only destined to the men following us, our organization, but to also address the others: being those opposed to the system today after having been militant in bourgeois organizations of the neo-Fascist right, being those who push back against the present regime after having been militant in the formations (we should also qualify them in this case: bourgeois) of the revisionist left.

It addresses, among the first, above all to these friends who, although having made the same doctrinal choices as us – according to the principles of the true state – and although being close to us by their attachment to a differentiated vision of man, remain inert and disappointed following their past political activity and disconcerted by our objective choices.

To those we must also repeat that no opposition separates our doctrinal premises from our practical orientations: because they are not such different solutions that we expose in a final fashion, distinct to the plan and we utilize it and the angles of view where we place it.

To those we equally affirm that principles are not overly intellectual abstractions that report the true nature of alibis destined to hide powerlessness: but they should be valued, on the contrary, as paradigms for an action that finds a concrete realization in the order of a historically determined situation. The adherence to the principle – we repeat it – is not accomplished by conceptual formation, by rational clarification, or, in general, by mental elaborations! To adhere to the principle means to exercise an impulse towards the realization of the principle: firstly in the existential domain of each – that its to say in the sphere of character – then, (we should say: simultaneously) as attempting to accomplish the realization in the domain of the state. And that transforms any social organizations (a simply natural phenomenon, because the existence of many individuals intrinsically implies an organization, so elementary in itself) into a state – disregarding “juridical” meaning of the term- it’s exactly the adherence of a community, groups of men, to an idea, to a principle, to an organic vision of life animated by this principle.

Arriving at this point, an element always acquires for us a most grand certitude: to think that no true tension that can transcribe in reality the principles of the true state will arise – and even when it arises it is aborted – is thus to remain alive in the “bearing structures” of bourgeois regimes, thus the residual components remain strong and the sources of derivation of bourgeois society (that is to say the economic substrate) remain intact. The “milieu” that draws life from must be sterilized: such is the reason for a communist economic regimentation.

What we do not oppose to this problem, the problem of the modes of destruction of the bourgeois regime, is only a contingent question and can thus be resolved in a more or less long space of time. We are also convinced that bourgeois society is neither eternal nor immortal: but it is exactly this certainty that incites us to accelerate the time of its fall and not to remain immobile and foreign to the unfolding of this phenomenon.

Regarding the pretend necessity of detachment and apolitea, some of our experiences oblige us to reveal two existing fashions or interpretations of being detached in the face of events: there is a fashion of being, the superior detachment of those who have truly attained some mountaintop (who has in effect discovered the unknown and resolved it into his own existential equation), and there is an attitude of those who only want to appear as such and manifest the detachment proper to the senseless and obtuse.

Consequently, to renounce the struggle by supporting that whose effect is intended but however does not touch the essential, when we choose the proving grounds, means to only express a sophism, the alibi of those who, constitutionally, are inclined to renunciation or who allowed themselves to be possessed by deceptions.

Moreover, who can consider as a trifling thing the struggle against the bourgeois regime? It is today a system that, as such, offers space and “freedom” to all: also, and above all, to those who are “its” dialectical opponents! Paradoxically, as long as the “opponents” or “contestants” of the bourgeois regime exist, it will burn them and digest all.

Our task, in fact, is not to limit ourselves to provoking damages or simple destruction of the regime, but to provoke the disintegration. The regime, we can compare it to one of these unicellular organisms with an elementary structure, that when cut, regrows, that mutilated, reforms: we must aim for the unique sensible and subtle organ, on which the whole gelatinous mass depends, the core, to act in this regard as antibiotics can act.

It is exactly that – the destruction of the system – our immediate historical task: it means to testify actively to the principles of the true state in our typical historical situation. It has for us the value of tension and the adherence to the elements at the base of our vision of the world: and I am sure that if we unite to accomplish this task – the disintegration of the bourgeois system – we will have done much, we will have contributed to the development of these objective processes of historical extraction that are imposed on us.

We are fanatics, and fanatics that aim to be always more lucid (*). And that it is exactly proper for the fanatic, to assume a vision of the world and, that being recognized, of life that is directed towards it, detached from all the effective means to attain it (and therefore ready to utilize them).

Outside of that, there is no other, different perspective. It could only appear under ambiguous and equivocal traits, to those who like to amuse themselves with messianic hopes, to those who are effected by Don Quixotesque sentiments. And, certainly, that is not who we will “convince”, these blind of sight or deaf of hearing, because they are exactly blind and deaf, they are deprived of these natural capabilities and we, on our side, if we have the dispositions of wonder workers, we will even have the possibility – more decisive, and maybe more edifying as well – of constructing robots and leaving to them the conquest of power.

In reality the fact of hearing determined orientations, homogeneous, and clear, the fact of assuming similar points of reference, does not depend – we repeat it – on dialectical hypotheses, but is derived from a priori affinities, of dispositions that we dare to say are transcendental, of vocations that are superior to the simply mental and rational domain – in which at most, if it is “in order”, can (in a solely opaque fashion) reflect them. It is to discover these choices of destiny, to manifest them, to unleash them when they exist, not to create them or fabricate them when they do not.

The appeal addressed to these men who, according to the parliamentary schemes, compose the fringes of the extreme-right of the system, is finished. We, however, we would like to address those who radically refuse the system, all who lie beyond the left of the regime, certain ones with which we could realize a loyal unity of action in the struggle against bourgeois society (11).

It is true that for them, who do not adhere at all (or support) metaphysical principles, who do not pursue the myth of the true state at all, the fact of indicating a superhuman direction, meta-politically and meta-historically and the fact of evoking a superior "reality" by attributing it all the characteristics of truth, will be interpreted as a sublimation, not to say, downright, as a schizophrenic affliction.

But it is true – and above all – that abstraction makes sources of doctrinal derivation – superhuman, meta-politically, meta-historically for us; exclusively human, historical, social for them – the objective that constitutes the political task and animates action in the historical temporal order is the same for both: to destroy the bourgeois system. The identical requirement of organizing life in the state is outside the bourgeois economic dialectic; that poses in the same terms of necessity the aspiration to break the classist structures on which the bourgeoisie bases its domination; that even the same tension of struggle presses and mobilizes the same camps to reintegrate the man – made free by alienating bonds that bourgeois dictatorship imposes on him – into the liberty and dignity that will return to him.

The two camps want to do what must be done: arrive at the outlet. If, for us, the outlet only means having accomplished a part of the voyage, such that for those the voyage is finished (or following other directions), that does not prevent the voyage along the river that must be accomplished by both and the currents that must be surmounted by both.

It takes for one or the other that character of an identical certainty that poses to them the requirement of a loyal strategy of common struggle: without confusion of ranks and roles, but by considering the identity of each. (*)

And for that, to cut through the bourgeois infection, that one or the other must unite around a common objective of struggle, that they must form a single front of action, by surpassing in a decided fashion all the forms of intellectual dogmatism and by breaking sharply with all manifestations of pseudo-revolutionary complacency. Those are, in effect, what permits the virus of bourgeois society to sterilize in a definitive manner the will to struggle of the revolutionary anti-capitalist forces, and exhausts its energy in abstract and dialectical disputes.

It is necessary, ultimately, that the forces engaged in the unitary struggle against the system for the subversion of the system to summarize their true objectives in a radical fashion. By abandoning the tactics smothered by legalistic bonds or by reformist illusions: without any hesitation – or guilt – before the use of all those drastic and definitive means that conform to battering the obstacles and reclaiming the grandeur of the goal.

It is necessary, in effect, to be persuaded of that: for a political soldier, purity justifies all hardship, disinterest all ruses, such that the impersonal character imprints on the struggle the dissolution of all moralistic preoccupations.

End Notes

Claudio Mutti

1 – The revolutionary perspective of the Castroite and Guevarist guerrilla was advanced, according to Ludovico Garruccio by the revolutionary combatants of the national-populist movements like the Bolivian Socialist Falange or the National Revolutionary Movement, active during the 40s: “the young Bolivians officers, the intellectuals of the Falange and MNR came from the same populist, xenophobic, and even racist type as the Romanian Iron Guard and like those, made appeal to nationality, to Bolivianidad for the recovery of the subaltern masses; like them, they always paid a most high tribute of blood and, like the Iron Guard and the Arrow Cross, found a working and popular audience superior to those of the Marxists” (Momenti dell’ esperienza politica latino-americana. Tre saggi su populismo e militari in America Latina, a cura di Ludovico Garruccio, Bologna 1974; Introduction). “Between Guevara and Mishima” – so Garruccio says – “between a South American intellectual who searched for the beautiful death in the trenches of libertadores and caudillos of romantic times and the Japanese writer that claimed, by his spectacular harakiri, the ethic of heroism, there is a common fidelity to traditional values” (ibid)

The legendary prototype of the Latin-American guerrilla, Guevara is the author of this significant phrase that Freda proposed in 1970 in the edition of Evolian writings *The Aryan Doctrine of Battle and Victory*: “To find the formula to perpetuate in daily life the heroic comportment of the guerrilla is, from the ideological point of view, one of our fundamental tasks... The instrument to mobilize the people must be essentially a moral order.”

General Peron, to whom Guevara sent, with a friendly dedication, his book on the techniques of guerrilla warfare, declared in an interview accorded to Jean Thiriart: “Castro is a promoter of liberation. He supports an imperialism because the neighbors of the other are in danger of being crushed. But the objective of the Cubans is the liberation of the peoples of Latin-America. Their sole intention is to constitute a bridge head for the liberation of continental countries. Che Guevara is a symbol of this liberation. He was great because he served a great cause, as far as embodying it. He was the man of an ideal.” (“La Nation Européene” February 1969).

The national-populist heritage of Peronism and of the guerrilla movement of Cuban inspiration seems to have been reprised today by the Montoneros. This organization, characterized by its bonds with Argentine culture and with the most authentic Peronism, represents today the most valuable revolutionary force among those that struggle in Latin America against the tentacles of American-Zionist imperialism.

[From certain information, without a doubt it is necessary to nuance a bit the altogether favorable judgment towards the Montoneros and consider that this movement has broken into many factions. On one side, the press attracted the attention to the case of the Israeli banker David Graiver, nicknamed the “Banker of the Montoneros”, who had trouble beginning with the Argentine military dictatorship for having financed terrorist activities and for whom his Zionist supporters had triggered a vast campaign of solidarity (cf, “Lectures Françaises”, June 1978, pp. 9-10); on the other side according to a communique published in Beirut and reported in “Le Monde” (9/20/1978), we learned that the “Palestinians furnished arms to the Montoneros” and that “Palestinians and Montoneros, who have been in contact since 1972, are engaged in mutual support in their respective struggles against Israel and the Argentine junta.” (Note of Eric Houellefort)]

2 – This style represented, in the anti-plutocratic struggle of the Vietnamese people, an element irreconcilable with the bourgeois rationalism and pacifism of this Marxist ideology to which the directors of Hanoi verbally

referred; thus it is true that, behind the official facade of Marxist-Leninism, it was affirmed and taught that “the spirit continues to be the fundamental factor of relations between man and weapon, because this, so modern in itself, is only an inert object without the intervention of man.” (Giap), The North-American strategy, that ascribes the fate of war to the “machine” factor, and not to the “man” factor, was vanquished in the clash with the Vietnamese people, whose leaders had benefited from the teaching of Hsiao Hoa, director of the political department of the Chinese Army, which had affirmed that the “result of war is decided by man... victory is impossible if we follow the theory according to which arms are decisive.”

3- Not only “anti-Semites” like Wagner and Chamberlain but also Jews like Weininger noted the existence of an analogy between the English type and the Jewish type, if we are to judge by the fortune encountered in England by the “origin myth” that affirms that they are the descendants of the Jews. That would be better to leave the unreal character of views of those, within National-Socialism, filled with illusions on the availability of England (a nation indisputably of the “white race” – but the Jews and the Yankees are as well!) to the appeal of German geopolitical projects.

The fallacious biological categories on which the said illusions are based can uniquely serve – if we utilized them as a foundation of actual geopolitics – to furnish an alibi to North American occidentalism, heir of the cosmopolitan British imperialism. And in fact, certain miserable mercenaries of the West have exactly claimed, above all in the anti-communist crusade, the defense of the “white race”; mercenaries that, alternately, supported French intervention in Indochina, the North-American wars against Korea and Vietnam, the Israeli attack against Egypt and the Anglo-French intervention in Suez, the action of mercenaries in the Congo, the Algerian putsch, and so on, even as far as the Zionist raid on Entebbe and the different white “presences” in Africa: from Portuguese missionaries to the plutocrats of South Africa to the Calvinist merchants of Rhodesia.

4- “In the context of geopolitics and a communal civilization, it will thus be further demonstrated in the unitary and communitarian Europe extending from Brest to Bucharest” Thus Jean Thiriart began his book *An Empire of 400 Million Men: Europe* (Brussels, 1964), published in Italian translation in 1965. We cannot stop ourselves here on the numerous points where the work of Thiriart has today an incontestable value – although certain theses of the book, linked to contingent historical events, have been surpassed by writers following the author, above all in the magazine “The European Nation” – we will content ourselves to a single merit of Thiriart: that of having placed clearly, with lucid and realist arguments, the limited perspectives of petty nationalism (“the skimpy petty nationalisms cancel each other ... it is nonsense, it is a formal contradiction of pretending to hold a force of addition of frozen and contemptible particularisms”), of the romantic nostalgia of old combatants (“We despise the paralytic patriotism of cemeteries, the vain patriotism of the bearers of ribbons and trinkets”), of absurd national conceptions constructed on biological or linguistic homogeneity (“for our nationalism, it’s the identity of destiny willed in view of a common grand design.”)

But, besides that, the limit of Thiriart consists exactly in his secular nationalism, supported by a Machiavellian conception of politics and deprived of all justification from a transcendent order. The historical clashes resolve themselves, for him, in a relation of brutal forces, such that the state embodies nothing other than a Nietzschean “will to power,” put in the service of a project of European hegemony marked by a smug and blind exclusivist pride (“a type of man, for numerous centuries, has clearly emerged from the magma of peoples and races, that is the European man”; “The Orient was only ever fertile in the domains of metaphysics and mysticism, not particularly constructive activities” (!) ; “The other peoples can only diminish their gap, catching

up, in the sole measure where they renounce their culture or they adopt ours, much more fertile.”) (Citations from J. Thirart, *An Empire of 400 Million Men: Europe*).

It is to the “indifferentist” and problematic “myth of Europe” that the violent critique of Freda is addressed, a critique that does not touch, according to us, the indisputable value of Thiriart on the indispensable continental dimensions of the territory of a state that is understood today to play a determinant role in global history.

5 – We have shown elsewhere (Introduction to *Discorsi sull’arte nazionalsocialista d’Hitler*, Ed. Di Ar, Padua 1977; trad. fr. In *Totalité No 4*, Paris 1978) how “totalitarian” revolutions of the 20th century have pushed for, with a perfect equivalence of terms, bourgeois conceptions of art. What we want to reveal here, that the bourgeois aesthetic, by making art “a voluptuary article destined for parasitic loafers” – to utilize the expression of Lukacs who, as the son of a banker, could affirm by knowing the cause – erected in a system of profane ignorance. “Docti rationem artis intelligunt, indocti voluptatem,” said Quintilien to that effect, opposing the comprehension of artistic symbolism to the appreciation of art in terms of pleasure (from the point of seeing or hearing), of taste, of agreeable sensation.

6 – Herbert Marcuse, a disciple of Freud and Marx and the mentor of the Yankee new left, published in Italian, in 1967, *The One-Dimensional Man*, a critique of advanced industrial society conducted in the name of the ideal, still more advanced, of the irrationalist “imagination.”

In the *The One-Dimensional Man*, Marcuse denied the neutrality of science, perceiving in it an instrument proper to rationalize the exploitation of man and nature: “Society is reproduced itself in a technical ensemble conscious of the objects and relations that include the utilization of technology by men (...). Technical-scientific rationality and manipulations are welded together into new forms of social control” (Op. cit. Trad it. Torino 1967, p. 160)

But the denunciation of Freda of the functional character of science in relation to bourgeois progress is attached to a current of thought marked by a sign algebraically opposed to those characterized by the polemic of Marcuse: it is this current of thought that is expressed in the Guenonian opposition between “sacred science” and “profane science,” in the Evolian destruction of the myth of “neutral science” (“many still believe that science is the product of automatic and objective processes”, and recently, in the considerations of a Muslim author, who attaches to the birth of material and quantitative science “to causes profoundly rooted and to certain limits of theological formulations of Latin Christianity” and demonstrates “the unlimited and blind application of science in the West” from fact that “Christianity is a religion without a Sacred Law” (S. Hossein Nasr, *L’uomo e la natura*, Milano 1977, p. 139).

7- It is maybe not at all devoid of interest to recall that the massive practice of sports enters among the programmatic points of the famous “Elders of Zion”: “Soon we are going to launch announcements in journals, inviting the people to take part in concourses of every type: artistic, sport, etc.” (C. Mutti, *Ebraicità ed ebraismo*. I Procolli dei Savi di Sion, Ed. Di Ar, Padua 1976, p. 118). We have already spoken of the high degree of Judaism present in English civilization; because certain people have remarked that “modern sports is for a large part, a donation of England to the world, from which the world learned to use much better than other donations, equally provided by England: parliamentary government and jury trial in matters of penal law” (J. Huizinga, *La crisi della civiltà*, Torino 1964, p. 111). It is in effect the Anglo-Saxon world that made from the instrument of sports “the principal and definitive safety valve of bourgeois society.” In the particular case of the American “Promised Land,” this phenomenon has benefited, incontestably, from the typical infantilism of the Yankees. On

this subject, Huizinga remarked that this characteristic “manifests itself in certain American universities, where sport competitions acquire an essential importance, putting intellectual life on the second tier.” In the bourgeois West, infantilism – which, according to Sombart, diffuses in concert with the cult of material wealth included in the capitalist economy – manifests very particularly in the organization of sports activities, in the “excessive importance given to sports activities in the daily press, without talking of specialized journals, as far as becoming the spiritual nourishment of numerous individuals.” (J. Huizinga, Op. cit. p. 112)

8 – “The proletariat reclaims his place in the banquet of life,” proclaims a Marxist writer cited by Sombart, who observes that “socialist proletariat” life, cultivates an ideal that “oscillates between material enjoyment and the desire to ‘live his life,’ ‘of participating in the blessing of culture,’ ‘of developing all the qualities of the individual’ etc.” by always judging fundamentally “for this state of things, dreaming of rich dotage in material goods,” remains completely on the interior of the mental universe proper to the economic era: Marxism, “the shop owners conception of society”, does not know different values from “those of bourgeois civilization, which exactly wants the proletariat to participate in it.” (W. Sombart, *Il socialismo tedesco*, Firenze, 1934, pp. 113-114).

Céline insulted, with the violence proper to himself, the consumable characteristics of proletariat aspirations: “Tripe will always be to the shame of man, you will never have a moving credo, a title of nobility. The tripe is always an error of the bearer of the bulwarks, the tripe will always be only the greatest ridicule of our easements, the most pitiable of our shit(...). Greedy guts of proletarians against the bourgeois shrunken guts. It’s all democracy’s mysticism... Class consciousness is bullshit, a demagogic convention. Each worker only demands to leave his working class, to become bourgeois, the most individualist possible, as quick as possible.” (L.F. Céline, *L’école des cadavres*, Paris 1938, pp. 105-128-129).

9- The tendency of bureaucratic-proletarian democracies of Eastern Europe converges towards the same results of exploitation obtained by the partiocratic – labor union – bourgeois dictatorships of the West represents the application of Marxist orthodoxy, not a deviation in relation to it. Already Sombart, in his critic of Marxism affirms that it would like to construct the future world with the material offered by capitalism. “The yet undetermined nature of capitalism” – he wrote – “makes sure that it seems apt to become the producer of desires that animate the spirit of Marx. But, in exactly that, by the fact of confiding in capitalism the task of realizing his own aspirations, Marx shows that from the depths of his soul he loved capitalism...” (W. Sombart, *Il capitalismo moderno*, Torino 1967, p. 490.) It is this congenital condition of the real guard that gives birth to the inferiority complex from which the Marxists of proletariat democracies suffer from in regard to more opulent bourgeois democracies, the inferiority complex that periodically engenders attempts at adaption (Yugoslav self management, Zionist Prague “Spring,” the progression of technocrats in Poland, etc.)

But it is important to understand that the position adopted by Freda in regards to the bureaucratic-Marxist democracy is of an algebraically opposed sign to those represented by different “dissidents” (Christians like Solzhenitsyn, progressives like Sakharov, Marxists of the “new left” like Hegedüs, various Jews), whose task consists of the acting for the goal of a future alignment of their respective countries – and in the “socialist” camp in general – to the Western model, as far as total integration. The “dissidents” represent in fact the visible and provocative vanguard that the West is in the middle of sending against the “backward” zones of Eastern Europe: it is thus significant that their watchwords (“rights on man” and others) are directed against these aspects of the “socialist” regimes (authoritarianism, single party, military power, etc) that, although submitted to a deviant and deformed orientation, could always represent a point of appeal and an instrument for

national-communist tendencies and even national-socialists who exist in certain milieus in the East. And it is in this ideology of certain “dissidents” sincerely faithful to Marxism that manifests the impossibility of an anti-capitalist Marxism. Presenting the book of a Hungarian dissident, A. Jannazzo clarifies for us the doctrinal characteristics of the “new left”: “The anti-capitalism of Hegedüs is entirely on the interior of the modern world: it is deprived of solidarist, populist, or pre-capitalist suggestions... The ‘new city’ of Hegedüs ... based on the creation of ‘effective communities’ is as full of humanist sentiments as it is of effort or work...” (A. Hegedüs, *La struttura sociale dei paesi dell’Europa orientale*, Milan 1977, pp. 7-8). The polemic is evidently directed against these “soldarist, populist, or pre-capitalist” elements whom, in Eastern Europe, have not disappeared and that the pro-Western dissidence, otherwise faithful to the progressive program of Marxism, means to combat and eliminate.

[It seems to us a bit excessive to put Solzhenitsyn in the same bag as the other dissidents. Someone who has known him well wrote: “Without a doubt it would be unjust to accuse Solzhenitsyn of wanting to arouse petty nationalist sentiments among his countrymen. It does not show in the least that he is in harmony with such sentiments instinctively. His own convictions are powered by the most profound Russian experience., that he was never tempered by the civilizing influences of a democratic tradition (sic!). The Soviet leaders are aged and struck with immobility: if one day, following a crisis of succession or conflict with China, elements of the right would arrive in power in the USSR, Solzhenitsyn ... could return home in triumph” (Olga Carlisle, *L’audience de Soljenitsyne en Occident*, in “*Le Monde Diplomatique*”, Sept. 1978, p. 2) For his part Solzhenitsyn explained that he is opposed to the Soviet regime “not because it is anti-democratic, authoritarian, founded on physical constraint – a man can live in these conditions without any attenuation of his spiritual essence”, but because “outside of physical constraint, it requires from us the complete surrender of our souls.”: (cited by Arthur Schlesinger, in “*The Washington Post*” of 6/25/1978). After his very maladroit declarations in favor of Pinochet and the American intervention in Vietnam – declarations that were without a doubt made by him from a certain ignorance of the political wings of American imperialism – Solzhenitsyn has recently denounced “the great sympathy of American intellectuals for socialism and communism,” sympathy that comes, according to him, from “materialism and atheism, common sources of the their ideological origins.” He violently attacked the last wave of emigration that “only represents the last link of emigrations towards Israel”, and condemned, without naming them, the Zionists, motivated by “a ferocious hate, not of the Soviet System but of Russia and its people.”; those who, according to Solzhenitsyn, sought to convince the Europeans that a “national renaissance or even the simple existence of the Russian people represents the gravest danger for the West.” (cf. “*Le Monde*” of 2-20-1979). (Note by E. Houellefort)].

10- It seems exactly that it is necessary, given the objections raised on the subject of communist principles enunciated by Freda. Those who confound communism and Marxist socialism evident ignore that communist programs were enunciated far before Marx and Engels. To remain in the domain of European culture and to refer only to the political thought of the modern and contemporary age, recall Utopia of Thomas More and City of the Sun by Campanella, political projects traced on the model of Platonic Politeia; we cite the doctrines of Morelly and Mably, the attempts of Babeuf to install an authoritarian communism, the ideal of the Phalanstery dreamed of by Fourier, the Icarian utopia of Cabet. Apart from of these gambles by individual theories, it is undeniable that certain traditional civilizations – some still remain today, certain “primitive” cultures – were characterized, in the socioeconomic domain, by a collectivist organization. Nevertheless, they will reply, “normal” civilizations that have historically succeeded in the European sphere, during Antiquity and the Middle Ages, attributed a legitimacy to personal property, even if they accorded little importance to the economic side

of existence (or, maybe, exactly because of that). We can respond to this objection by affirming that these cycles are definitively closed; it is not obligatory to say that a new traditional form should maintain the economic type that characterized the preceding forms. In addition, Freda brings to light the fact that private property, today, plays a fundamental role in the existence of the bourgeois world, a very different role than in the classical civilizations or in Medieval civilization. "At the origin" – wrote Spengler – we had goods because we were powerful. Now we are powerful because we have money. Intellect reaches the throne only when money puts it there. Democracy means the perfect equivalence between money and political power." (O. Spengler, *Le déclin de l'Occident*). If although the solution proposed by Freda seems a bit strong it is better to understand it as an extreme remedy to an extreme sickness.

11- In similar terms, Malynski contrasted the unity of action between the extreme right and the extreme left to a "historical compromise" which sees its premonitions in the coinciding interests relating big capital and party bureaucracies and labor unions: "Against the bloc of democratic insolence, of financial rapacity, and Jewish domination, there must be the bloc of the extreme right and the extreme left." The Polish aristocrat did not hesitate to reveal "a certain deep affinity between what we call the extreme right and the extreme left, as strange as it seems, they are precisely the two parties on the contemporary social chessboard between which, if we disregard the superficial, there is not, in reality, any antithesis of aspirations and fundamental interests. On the contrary, this antithesis and irreducibility necessarily exists from both sides regarding the bourgeoisie." (E. Malynski, *L'Empreinte d'Israël*, Paris 1926, pp. 38 – 41)

In May 1968 in Italy, the unity of action supported by Malynski quickly emerged. Formations of the extreme right like "Primula Goliardica" and "Caravella" refused visceral anti-communism in the name of the primary requirement to struggle against the system, alongside different groups of the extreme left that saw in the anti-fascist crusades a revisionist maneuver to save the bourgeois system, such that the vanguard "National-Europeans" like "Jeune Europe" and "Lotta di Popolo" both acted to reinforce this attack concentrated against the powers that be. Faced with a new and dangerous situation, the regime mobilized, besides the Special Police of the Carabinieri, the bourgeois henchmen of the PCI and the MSI. Only to cite a few episodes: in Milan, a group of MSI attempted to attack the Department of Arts, under the watchful eye of the police; in Rome, activists of the PCI tried to burn the Department of Architecture; the following day, Tricolor band led by Almirante and Caradonna lead the assault against the Department of Law to "liberate" it from the "communists" (who, it happens, were students of "Primula Goliardica," "Caravella," etc.) In brief, the coordinated maneuvers of the anti-communists and anti-fascists broke the unity of action that was in the processes of occurring. In 1977, it seems that ultras of the right had helped to chase Lama – epigone of Caradonna – from the University of Rome, thus they signaled, in the same year, the presence of an "ordonovisti" in the course of clashes that had taken place in Bologna between the autonomists and police.