

Cum grano Salis.

On elections,
anti-fascism
and war

This is the whole point, since a *qualitative* difference between electoral anti-fascism and militant anti-fascism does not exist and has never existed. There are differences in degree and intensity in the struggle. Differences in the use of violence. But ultimately militant anti-fascism always risks spilling over into electoral anti-fascism because both are based on the same misunderstanding: the idea that among bourgeois forces that clash, some are worse than others, and that in general fascism is always the worst of all. In the face of this absolute evil, it is okay to ally with anyone.

july 2024

The Great War of the 21st century is having increasingly strong repercussions on liberal capitalist regimes (the so-called West). The United States are governed by a tired elderly man likely suffering from dementia, are divided by class and racial fractures, and are witnessing the rise of an increasingly angry “white” working class currently monopolized by the Trumpian right. Trump himself survived an attack, barely dodging several rifle shots, one of which grazed his head while another supposedly hit him in his bulletproof vest. Since February 2022 (the date of the Russian invasion of Ukraine) the United Kingdom changed four governments, a record that was not even reached 1970s Italy. The first three of these governments were expressions of the same conservative party, a sign of the deep fractures within the traditional political families (the record within the record: Liz Truss’s ministry, which lasted just 44 days, from 6 September to 25 October 2022). In Germany, the social democracy in power leads the country to war against Russia, sending weapons and above all pursuing the suicidal policy of sanctions: the largest European industry deprives itself of the privileged relationship with the largest exporter of energy goods on the continent, industrial production collapses, workers abandon the reformist and warmongering left. In France, while the country is shaken by the class struggle against the pension law and by the insurrections of the sub-pro-

letariat of the suburbs, the European elections (which historically don't matter at all) are perceived as the moment of maximum hysterical precipitation of social life, primarily by the initiative of the president of the republic. Macron tries to make people forget his own atrocities by focusing the debate entirely on the war: anyone who does not support the complicity in the genocide in Gaza is accused of anti-semitism, anyone who does not agree with the interventionist policy against the Russian Federation is accused of being an accomplice of Putin; by continuously raising the stakes, he bet all his cards on the fact that his competitors would not be able to follow him in his warmongering extremism. His latest boast is the dispatch of French troops to Ukraine, a clear prelude of the Third World War and the nuclear apocalypse. And what is the result? A crushing defeat that forces him to dissolve the parliament and call for early elections.

If future scholars in a thousand years' time were to read these words, they might think that they were browsing through the introductory paragraph of the history book chapter that covers the great international revolution of the 2020s. On the contrary, social movements find themselves cornered, not only incapable of reacting, which would be understandable in the face of preponderant enemy forces, but even worse, they are complicit in the policies of the rulers and act as a con-

servative force, defending the *status quo*.

The fraud, the shackles that prevents this leap in quality, is modern anti-fascism. Not to be confused with historical anti-fascism, certainly not without limits and contradictions. What distinguishes today's anti-fascism from that of the last century is that it is an anti-fascism in the absence of fascist danger. Its main goal is to divide the proletariat and to include the antagonistic left within war policies, an auxiliary troop in defense of masters and rulers. Historical anti-fascism has often performed the same political-social operation, with the difference that at least at the time fascism and Nazism were dramatically real facts. The only way out of the impasse is to center the opposition to the war. A matter of heart and brain, both to stop slaughter and because it seems to be the only way to truly oppose the return of nationalism, authoritarianism, and militarism, which have always been, after all, the true faces of fascism.

Antisocial electoralism and the defeat of the war party

The European elections caused an earthquake in large areas of the continent. More than half of the electorate (both in Italy and on a continental level) did not vote. In Italy the figure rises to 58% among workers and is stronger in the south than in the north. Simply put, the

poorer you are, the less you vote, as in the title of an opinion poll conducted by ADNkronos¹.

Electoralism in this context is not just a reformist choice, rather an antisocial one! It means addressing an absolute minority of the population, an even larger minority among the proletariat, where abstention becomes overwhelming if we consider people who do not have the right to vote (immigrants or people convicted with sentences above a certain entity).

Although only a minority voted, it expressed a certain degree of intolerance towards the war policies that are impoverishing European populations. In the main European countries, France and Germany, the warmongering governments suffered a crushing defeat. In France, President Macron even dissolved parliament and called for new parliamentary elections.

What revolutionaries should do in this context is to transform the passive revolt against the war, a revolt of the pencil or more often of the sofa, into a conscious, defeatist revolt. From electoral desertion to political-military desertion.

The rulers of the continent lock themselves into an autistic defense, obsessively pursuing the same policies and refusing to face reality. The warmongering and ultra-liberal Ursula von der Leyen is confirmed as

1. <https://demografica.adnkronos.com/popolazione/elezioni-europee-2024-astensionismo-maggiore-con-piu-poverta-analisi-italy-and-member-countries/>

president of the European Commission. The next “high representative for foreign affairs and security policy”, a bureaucratic term that corresponds to a sort of “foreign minister” of the Union, will be Kaja Kallas: the current Estonian prime minister, with an unenviable anti-Russian pedigree, daughter of deportees to Siberia. She became a protagonist for her stubborn determination in the destruction of Soviet-era monuments and on a less symbolical level she is an aggressive supporter of the war in Ukraine: a clear choice to continue with war policies. In other words, despite the defeat, European governments persist in the same mistakes that led to the current crisis. They deny reality. They lock themselves in a fort. In this context the revolutionaries should storm the fort!

Instead, what the European antagonistic movement does is... take to the streets against the fascist danger. That is to say, in defense of the fort. The news coming from Germany are striking. The streets fill up to protest against *Alternative für Deutschland*, but the social democracy, which votes for war credits like it did a hundred years ago, remains in government and is not attacked with the same intensity. There is something unsaid, an underlying misunderstanding: all in all, even if we don't admit it, even if it isn't nice to write it, the social democrats seem better to us than neo-Nazis; between two bourgeois fronts we choose the one on

the left. Meanwhile, capitalism can continue to sleep soundly: there are no alternatives on this slope, neither *für Deutschland* nor for Europe.

The eternal return of frontism

There is one thing for which the French left deserves recognition: clarity. In Italy, with the end of traditional parties, the political framework has been prey to the most imaginative transformism for decades. The center-left parties have changed their name and symbol at every political election: the oak with the hammer and sickle at its feet, the oak without the hammer and sickle at its feet, the daisy, the donkey, the olive tree. We must thank the French left for giving itself a clear name in the last elections: New Popular Front. A name with an important history, a... shitty history.

Let's refresh our memory. What was the Popular Front? Historically, the name indicates a tactic advocated by the Third International led by Stalin starting in 1933: fascism became the ultimate evil and no longer a bourgeois government like the others; to beat it, broad alliances open to all anti-fascist forces were proposed. Not only reformist socialists, but also bourgeois, liberal, republican forces – in Italy during the resistance even monarchists were part of it. An *interclass* alliance with the declared aim of defeating the most imminent dan-

ger, postponing the confrontation with the class enemy to an indefinite, more fortunate season. While the Soviet Union was falling into the darkest depths of the regime of terror and its economy was reconverted into the form of state capitalism, Stalin, being the undoubtedly ironic man that he was, rediscovered the need to defend democracy in a Western Europe endangered by Mussolini and Hitler.

The worst abominations were committed in the name of the popular front: in Spain we had the misfortune of witnessing anarchists become ministers, while the revolution was betrayed and collectivized companies were returned to their owners. In France the popular front government (1936) stood out for its reformist ignorance: while some reforms improved working hours, it did not even manage to decide to seriously support the “cousins” of the Spanish popular front during the civil war.

Historically speaking, the old popular front performed the function of liquidating once and for all the revolutionary drive in Europe, deploying the workers’ movement in defense of the institutions. With the final paradox of actually opening the way to fascist governments or occupying forces.

That a coalition with such an eloquent name was formed in France in the summer of 2024 should not surprise us but it should alarm us. The strategy is always the same.

Interclass alliance to fight the main enemy. And in fact in the second round of the legislative elections the parties of the New Popular Front had no hesitation in allying with Macron. Among the federations of the New Popular Front – in its summer 2024 edition – we find figures of the caliber of Raphaël Glucksmann: zionist, anti-Russian, possibly the one who more than anyone else insisted on making the left coalition conditional on the continuation of the war in Ukraine (today he could be rewarded, according to rumors, as a possible new head of government). But if the left and the antagonistic movements side with the little Napoleon who wants to send French soldiers to invade Russia, if they side with the most hated man in France for his anti-social policies, the above paradox is destined to repeat yourself: the right is gifted with an anti-system credibility it does not deserve.

Fascism is war

While this is not the place for an accurate theoretical definition of fascism, we believe that this simple statement can be shared by anyone. *Fascism is war* from its origins, with Mussolini betraying the socialist movement and becoming the founder of an interventionist newspaper financed by the States of the Entente to push Italy into the First World War. *Fascism is war* until

the end, with Hitler plunging Europe into the greatest massacre of all time.

Let's have a look the program of the New Popular Front (2024), for example on the Ukrainian issue. It says that it is necessary to “stop Vladimir Putin’s war of aggression and ensure that he is held accountable for his crimes before international justice system”; and to defend “*indéfectiblement*” the sovereignty and freedom of Ukrainian people and the integrity of Ukrainian borders. It further guarantees the delivery of the necessary weapons, the cancellation of Ukraine’s foreign debt, the seizure of oligarchs’ assets and, “within the framework permitted by international law, the deployment of peacekeeping forces to protect the nuclear power plants”².

Not only the continuation of military support to Ukraine, but even the deployment of “peacekeeping forces” – namely French soldiers directly engaged in an open war with Russia. The program of the New Popular Front is the program of the Third World War. An ideological and historical crime, as well as an enormous gift to the right wing that it says it wants to fight, and to which instead it cedes monopoly over the “pacifist” narrative (again the paradox of the Thirties: the popular front that ends up opening the road to the advent of fascism). Giving in to Glucksmann’s three conditions was the

2. [https:// jacobinitalia.it/il-programma-che-non-ti-aspetti/](https://jacobinitalia.it/il-programma-che-non-ti-aspetti/)

price to pay for keeping the front united: continued support for Ukraine, loyalty to NATO, loyalty to the EU.

The morning after the French ballots, the Italian newspaper *La Nazione* ran the headline: “Heavy blow for Putin”. We remember an old Italian slogan that used to be shouted during demonstrations in the seventies: “*Telegrafo, Nazione, the press of the masters*”. Evidently the master knows well which side he is on and who are his most faithful servants.

If fascism is war, what is the use of an “anti-fascism” which is also pro-war? If Le Pen’s electoral program is more “pacifist” than that of Macron and of the New Popular Front, evidently there is a scam somewhere. If the program of *Alternative für Deutschland* (AfD) is more “pacifist” than that of the Green parties, why aren’t *antifas* also attacking the Greens, but only the AfD? Such confusion! How can we get out of it? In reality the way is easier than one might think. We must have the courage to follow it and leave the company of those who are ambiguous or undecided. The way to go is to place the opposition to the war at the center of our revolutionary action. Starting from this centrality we can then illuminate all the other questions.

When the left goes to war

The current situation is not actually the result of a

sudden turn of the European left, but the outcome of a slow process that begins in the 1990s. With the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the European left embarks on a process of re-evaluation. Some parties go through years of crisis and difficulties, but they are also given a great opportunity to finally come to power, once the veto that hung over them for suspected sympathies with the communist enemy has been lifted. To achieve this result, it was necessary to demonstrate reliability, replacing Washington with Moscow as their polestar.

There is one image in particular which is worth resurrecting from the drawer of memories, especially because it is a moment in recent history that is too often forgotten. Spring 1999. NATO bombings are unleashed in the skies over Belgrade. A war cowardly like few others, with the sixteen most industrialized countries in the world raging against the remains of the Yugoslavian Federation, bombing the Balkans for three months from such a safe distance that only two US soldiers were killed among the NATO troops. Among civilians, on the other hand, there were many casualties, 2,500 according to UN figures. If we consider that in two years of war in Ukraine around 10,000 civilian victims were officially recorded, we can grasp the scale of the massacre for small country of Serbia.

In the United States, the president was the democrat Bill Clinton. In Great Britain the prime minister was Tony

Blair, theorist and interpreter of what became known as “New Labour”, a futuristic attempt to refound the European left within the new postmodern canons.

In Italy the prime minister was Massimo D’Alema; the first ex-communist to cover that institutional role had to pay for his Atlanticist credibility in the circuits of the great Western bourgeoisie by bringing Italy into the Balkan carnage. Ours was the country that provided the greatest logistical contribution to the departure of bombers and missiles towards the skies of Yugoslavia. In Germany, the so-called red-green coalition was in power at the time, with the social democrat Gerhard Schröder as chancellor. Admittedly the *Grünen* were critical of the war, but in the end they remained in the government despite everything. Today things have changed a bit and the German Greens are among the main supporters of sending weapons to Ukraine, going even beyond the Social Democratic Party in asking for more vigorous support. But as they say, appetite comes with eating.

The condition of the French government is perhaps the most interesting to remember, given the similarities with the present. President of the republic was Jacques René Chirac, of the center-right, though he had to come to terms with a parliament with a left-wing majority: the government of the socialist Jospin was also supported by the Greens and the French Communist Party. A truly

disturbing historical similarity: that today another left-wing government supervised by a moderate president is being prepared for France as government of the war towards the east?

If we recall such sad memories it is not out of nostalgia for our youth as anarchist militants, but to underline two issues that concern the present. *The first*. Let us never forget that the war in Ukraine is the result of NATO's expansion to the east. They want to tell us that this expansion was the result of a democratic and voluntary choice by the countries of Eastern Europe. The skies above Belgrade recall a different story. *The second*. Do we really need an anti-fascist united front that helps this kind of left come to power?

Changing everything in order to change nothing

Are we really faced with the prospect of the establishment of fascist-type dictatorships in Europe? Perhaps the Italian situation can for once help us see clearly. In Italy, for almost two years, we have had a prime minister who comes from the political family of neo-fascism. Upon closer inspection, the Italian situation can therefore be taken as a measure of the degree of "fascistisation" of society. We do not deny that an authoritarian turn is underway in Italy. We are the European

country in which the emergency measures against the Covid-19 pandemic have been the most violent. Retrospectively, it was a real *exercise of war*: the curfew, militarization, obedience, and the mask instead of the helmet. While the state of emergency was being declared, on 8 March 2022 a series of riots shook Italian prisons and the regime forces intervened massively to repress them, causing sixteen deaths, the largest prison massacre in republican history. Fascist policies, one could say. Unfortunately, however, Giuseppe Conte was prime minister at the time, leading a center-left executive.

February 2022, the outbreak of full-scale war in Ukraine. Italy slavishly adheres to NATO 's military adventure, sending weapons and training Ukrainian soldiers on national soil. The media are completely subservient to the Atlanticist narrative, chauvinism soon slips into racism and Russophobia, courses on Dostoevsky are canceled from universities. The militant trade unionists are arrested on charges of "extortion", a most unfortunate juridical slip indicative of the attachment of the bosses to their own wallets. The regime's judicial system begins to allege the crime of "incitement to commit crimes with the aim of terrorism" as a way to shut down the anarchist press and arrest the comrades. These are the months in which the transfer of Alfredo Cospito to the 41 bis carcerary regime is orchestrated

and then executed, a real measure of war against the internal enemy and a warning for anyone who might think of disturbing the leader Duce. After all, we are at war. Fascist policies, one might say. Unfortunately, Mario Draghi was head of government, leading a coalition of National Unity.

Truth be told, the only parliamentary opposition force at the time was the post-fascist party of Giorgia Meloni, the current Italian prime minister. This also suggests that leaving the monopoly of the opposition to the right is not really a clever idea. A lesson that our French neighbors evidently did not want to listen to. However, with Meloni in power, things continued along the same path. Complicity with the genocide in Palestine was added to the war in Ukraine. ENI signed agreements with Israel for the extraction of gas off the coast of Gaza, a share of the loot, drenched in blood, of the imperialist robbery that our country participates in. Police operations against the anarchist press continued and as far as Alfredo Cospito is concerned, this government tried to kill him in his 41 bis confinement.

It is therefore undeniable that there is an authoritarian turn. The point is that the acceleration with which this new authoritarianism escalates is completely indifferent to the politicians who interpret it. Somehow, in the era of artificial idiocy, it has more to do with cybernetics than with politics. It is the necessity of the algorithm that

dictates its forms, political parties are a sort of mask of the Hegelian zeitgeist.

The same thing would have happened in France if Le Pen had won. That is, nothing would have happened. We could think of it as a sort of Tsipras-paradox, taking place on the right instead of on the left. Anyone can enter the government, whether they are far right or far left, but policies remain unchanged and are decided by the technical rationale, by big capital and by the military power of NATO. Tsipras, the president of the Greek radical left elected in the wake of the anti-austerity protests, ended up capitulating to the Troika and accepting the infamous *memoranda*, definitively extinguishing the popular uprising. Meloni, the far-right Italian president who won the elections because she was given a monopoly on the opposition to the Draghi government, is now carrying forward the Draghi agenda. The musicians change, but the score remains the same.

In terms of political theory, fascism has often been defined as a “reactionary mass movement”. What distinguishes it from other forms of authoritarianism, such as the post-Napoleonic Restoration or the cannon shots fired on the hungry crowd by the royal troops of Bava Beccaris, is that it is a movement in which the authoritarian turn is enthusiastically participated by hundreds of thousands of representatives of the middle and lower classes. A sort of hateful right-wing revolution. In this

sense, there is no fascist danger because the change of rulers does not produce revolutions (not even on the right, fortunately). In this sense, therefore, there is no fascist danger because in this historical juncture authoritarianism does not seem to have a grassroots platform (black shirts, brown shirts, etc.), but is oligarchic in nature, born in the circuits of finance and in the military elite, in the technocracy that holds the monopoly of scientific knowledge, in the increasingly autocratic management of the head of government. In short, the authoritarian turn in the 21st century seems to come from above and not from below.

The vexed question: what is the point of such a vast militant mobilization on the theme of anti-fascism in the absence of fascism? Or if you prefer to put it this way: what is the point of a specific fight against a single political party accused of being fascist, when it is the entire political framework that is increasingly authoritarian and “fascist”?

Ilaria condizionata³

The Salis affair is a dramatic confirmation of this confusion. Her tough personal situation became a club with which the Italian and European left attempted to strike their political opponents. The Italian left used it to em-

3. Literally “influenced Ilaria”, pun combining the name of Ilaria Salis with “air conditioning” (“aria condizionata” in Italian).

barrass the Meloni government for its friendly relations with Victor Orbán. The European liberal left used it to attack the sovereigntist right. If we consider the fact that Hungary is the European country that most strongly resisted and hindered the support for Ukraine – certainly not because Orbán is a pacifist, but because of his dirty interests which partially align with those of Putin – the affair of the Budapest anti-fascists inevitably becomes a picklock with which the forces of war, the NATO party, the left-wing enemies of the tyrant Putin attempt to undermine and corner the Hungarian government, which is too indecisive and ambiguous.

To this objective fact, independent of the good intentions of the people involved (to whom we send our solidarity), we add one consideration which is more subjective, so to speak. Salis did not just run in the elections to get out of prison, hers was not the classic protest candidacy. After the elections she became a political figure. Perhaps the most respectful attitude we can have is to take seriously the specific political content she expresses. Let's have a look at a recent statement of hers, following the French elections.

“When the perception of danger increases and the stakes are clear, when the left fearlessly proposes “left-wing things” feeding on social and cultural struggles, when we emancipate ourselves from subordination to the ideology of neoliberal capitalism (Macro-

nism) and we steer towards a different horizon, when anti-racism becomes a practice to affirm real equality, that is, when we focus on concrete lives, then anti-fascism can win. This is what the unexpected result of the French elections teaches us: it was not just the traditional republican defense that held the barricade, but a real popular uprising – rich with perspective and imagination, whose potential is still to be explored – against the far right and its vision of the world. The game is still open and many difficult battles await us. But today is certainly a good day for France, for Europe and for all those who continue to believe in freedom, equality and brotherhood. Allons enfants!”⁴

What specific political contents can we gather from these words? Let’s start with what is *not* being said. While humanity is slipping on the slope that could lead to the third world war, with a massacre of proletarians that has been going on for over two years on the eastern front and a genocide that takes place every day live on social media in Gaza, not a word is said about the war. But it gets worse. The New Popular Front is defined as a force that “without fear” proposes “left-wing things”. Yes, left-wing things like sending weapons and soldiers to Ukraine?

In general, in the short text, written with undoubted political acuity, there is an attempt to couple radicalism and electoralism. The half-victory of the popular front

4. See the parliamentarian’s social media channels.

is described as “a real popular uprising”. It is stated that anti-fascism wins if it is radical, if it is not subordinated to neoliberal capitalism (which in France means Macronism). In principle, this statement is absolutely acceptable; it’s a shame, however, that it overlooks not only the fact that the program of the New Popular Front is a program of Atlanticist complicity and dangerous anti-Russian warmongering, as already highlighted, but even, if we look at the technical pittance of politics, Salis forgets that the the New Popular Front signed an electoral desistance pact with Macron, in which the centrists are granted the majority of the constituencies. It is worth mentioning just one name: Gérald Darmanin, the hated interior minister at the head of an increasingly authoritarian French police force, was elected thanks to the votes of the left within the aforementioned desistance pact.

On the other hand, a few words should be said on the Italian electoral list that brought Salis into the EU parliament. The electoral cartel that takes the name of “Alleanza Verdi e Sinistra” (Greens and Left Alliance, AVS) is an Italian political bloc composed of the Green party (the Verdi) and the leftist party Sinistra Italiana. These are two truly insignificant political forces, you never stumble upon one of their offices in our neighborhoods, no one knows a friend, a family member, a work colleague, a fellow student who is active in these

formations. This electoral cartel manages to enter the Italian parliament exclusively because it is allied with the Democratic Party (Partito Democratico, PD), the party of the big bourgeoisie, of the banks, of the progressive elites, of NATO. In the complicated Italian electoral system, the voter finds rectangles on the ballot containing the symbols of different lists. AVS is located in the same rectangle as PD, and this is the only reason it “exists” and manages to bring a handful of parasites into parliament.

Beyond the electoral mechanisms, the specific social function of this party is in fact an anti-fascist one. Voters who want the right wing to be defeated in the elections, but cannot bring themselves to vote for the Democratic Party and feel sick just thinking about it, by crossing the red and green list (AVS) they can contribute to the electoral alternative to the right wing bloc while they save their conscience. The Greens and Left Alliance is truly anti-fascism in all its stench.

This is the whole point, since a *qualitative* difference between electoral anti-fascism and militant anti-fascism does not exist and has never existed. There are differences in degree and intensity in the struggle. Differences in the use of violence. But ultimately militant anti-fascism always risks spilling over into electoral anti-fascism because both are based on the same misunderstanding: the idea that among bourgeois forces

that clash, some are worse than others, and that in general fascism is always the worst of all. In the face of this absolute evil, it is okay to ally with anyone.

Malatesta and fascism

Let us give the floor to a comrade who really faced fascism. In September 1921, a year before the March on Rome, Errico Malatesta wrote that “civil war is the only just and reasonable war”, highlighting that “by civil war we mean the war between oppressed and oppressors, between poor and rich, between workers and exploiters of the work of others, it does not matter whether the oppressors and exploiters are of the same nationality or not, whether or not they speak the same language as the oppressed and exploited”.

Malatesta spoke with full knowledge of the facts. The memory of the massacre of proletarians caused by the First World War must have been still fresh and painful. When there is a war between capitalist States, the war between peoples must be replaced by civil war, refusing to go and kill and be killed among proletarians, but bringing the war to the masters and rulers.

We then come to the war between fascists and anti-fascists. Malatesta asks whether the war between fascists and anti-fascists is one of these just and revolutionary wars, namely “a civil war that pits the people

against the government, the workers against the capitalists”. The answer the comrade gives us is negative: “the guerrilla war between fascists and subversives [...] serves only to shed blood and tears, to sow seeds of lasting hatred without benefiting any cause, any party, any class”.

Of course, this does not mean that for Errico fascism was not a problem, or that it should not be fought. There is no hiding the fact that fascism is a product “of the landowners and the capitalists” and that “to put an end to the fascist adventure, organized resistance is needed”. Yet, “while the resistance is being organized, we must recognize that within fascism it is not all scum and it is not all wrong”, but there are “many sincere young people”, “many workers”. The objective is then to defeat fascism, but certainly not to defend the *status quo*, but to ensure “that this absurd struggle ends, so that we can begin to fight a clear struggle”⁵.

Unfortunately, our comrade was under an illusion. More than a century later, this absurd struggle is still not over. We are still waiting to defeat the fascists in order to *then* start the revolution. In the meantime, we go and vote, we reconstitute the popular front and we postpone the civil war, year by year, century by century.

Malatesta was accused of underestimating fascism

5. The quotes are taken from *La guerra civile*, Umanità Nova, 8 September 1921; today in *Opere Complete*, vol. 1919-1923, p. 361

and its peculiarities. He was not the only one. The evergreen aphorism of Bordiga, the first secretary of the Communist Party of Italy (1921), according to whom “anti-fascism will become the worst product of fascism” still resonates today, depending on the interpreters, of great relevance or evidence of very little foresight on the part of that generation of revolutionaries. Indeed, if these are the comrades accused of having underestimated fascism, the coherence of such a class of underestimators would be extremely needed today! The main theme for the revolutionaries of that period was not the war against the fascists, but against the bourgeoisie, the oppressors, the State. While we fight an organized resistance to fascism, which is absolutely necessary, we must keep in mind how many proletarians are caught up in it and bring them back into our camp, that of the social revolution.

If one finds these quotes to be ancient and perhaps antiquated, let us consider how relevant these words are in our tragic present. Let’s return once again to Ukraine, a dramatic litmus test for unmasking opportunists and cheaters. When Putin invaded Ukraine he did so with the ridiculous aim of “denazification”. The Ukrainians, on their part, while shedding blood for NATO interests, call themselves the new “Resistance”. But what kind of ideal is this anti-fascism if it can be used by both opposing forces, if it is a banner that can be waved by

both governments of two nations at war with each other, while in both of those countries the authoritarian winds are blowing stronger than ever?

Anti-fascism is an ideal which, today as much as yesterday, does not divide the world according to the social class to which one belongs, but it manipulates it and confuses it, while remaining structurally available to be recuperated. Don't they tell us every 25th of April⁶ that Italy is a "Republic born from the Resistance"?

We don't want to cause misunderstandings. We hate fascism. We hate the old as well as the new right. We believe that often, however, it was precisely the policies of the institutional left that favored consensus for the authoritarian right. The politics of the popular front in the last century, by stopping the revolution, ended up helping the expansion of fascism. We are convinced that any self-proclaimed "new" popular front will only be able to repeat the same "old" mistakes.

We also believe that neo-fascists and neo-Nazis are dangerous. In the sense that they are hateful individuals who attack us, going as far as to kill our comrades. In this sense they are certainly a danger. When we say that we do not see a fascist danger, we only mean that

6. Italy's Liberation Day.

we do not see the possibility of these individuals establishing an authoritarian regime.

The authoritarian regime is already being established, but by the financial elite, the European technocracy, the militarist circles of NATO, the nuclear sorcerers, the transhumanist clans, the shamans of techno-scientific dominion. Left-wing parties and governments are often at the service of these forces.

Pliny the Elder in *Naturalis historia*, discussing pharmacology, recommended adding a pinch of salt to curative recipes, without which the *pharmakon* would have lost its effect. Since then the Latinism *cum grano salis* has been used as an expression to indicate doing things with a pinch of common sense, with a grain of salt. Without it, the recipe does not work.

When hundreds of thousands of proletarians are sacrificed on the altar of war, for the greater glory of psychopathic rulers and for the greater benefit of the wallets of weapons manufacturers and stock market speculators, when humanity is faced with the abyss of nuclear war, the pinch of salt that we should add to our recipes inevitably concerns the theme of war. Faced with the rivers of blood and the rivers of gold that flow, it is first and foremost a question of ethics. War is the issue that today separates the just from the infamous.

Not only that, war is also a question of tactics for revolutionaries. They must bet on the defeat of their country

to open up possibilities for revolution. If war shakes our societies, what we must do is not participate in popular and republican coalitions in defense of liberal democracies, but exacerbate the defeatist struggle to transform war into revolution. Let us abandon the Front. Let us make Europe ungovernable.

The three musketeers

Pliny the Elder in *Naturalis historia*, discussing pharmacology, recommended adding a pinch of salt to curative recipes, without which the *pharmakon* would have lost its effect. Since then the Latinism *cum grano salis* has been used as an expression to indicate doing things with a pinch of common sense, with a grain of salt. Without it, the recipe does not work. When hundreds of thousands of proletarians are sacrificed on the altar of war, for the greater glory of psychopathic rulers and for the greater benefit of the wallets of weapons manufacturers and stock market speculators, when humanity is faced with the abyss of nuclear war, the pinch of salt that we should add to our recipes inevitably concerns the theme of war. Faced with the rivers of blood and the rivers of gold that flow, it is first and foremost a question of ethics. War is the issue that today separates the just from the infamous. Not only that, war is also a question of tactics for revolutionaries. They must bet on the defeat of their country to open up possibilities for revolution. If war shakes our societies, what we must do is not participate in popular and republican coalitions in defense of liberal democracies, but exacerbate the defeatist struggle to transform war into revolution. Let us abandon the Front. Let us make Europe ungovernable.
