Part 5 – Conclusions to Disintegration of the System\_by Monsalvat

“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 am 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 adress 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 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 is 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.