

# Internationalist Papers



A publication of the International Communist Party (ICP)

## **THIS LATEST WAR**

(a special supplement)

Contents:

- \* Behind the false "War or Peace" option
- \* Pacifism in all forms opens up the way to imperialist war - Revolutionary defeatism is the only answer
- \* Against the imperialist war, pacifism or revolutionary defeatism? (a leaflet)
- \* May Day 2003: "There is no war that be not infamous, there is no peace that be desirable, until the reign of capital lasts" (a leaflet)

## BEHIND THE FALSE "WAR OR PEACE" OPTION

It is clear to everybody that what now interests all the chancelleries of the various imperialist brigands, falsely listed amongst the paladins of peace or of war, is the form that Iraq and the oil-producing Middle East will assume in the post-war period or, in any case, at the end of the present tug-of-war. It is on the control of energy sources and their commercial routes and distribution to the markets that what the various courts of analysts and economic, political and military experts call "global security" for the congested industrial machinery of the capitalist world depends. A capitalism that must necessarily consider it "vital" to control an area where it is presumed 60 to 70% of the established conventional reserves of raw oil is concentrated, and "top priority" (again in the words of English and American documents published in the press) to defend a raw material whose cost is a major factor in determining the profit margin of the main industrial sectors. As in classical pirate stories, those who control these key points in the pattern of world accumulation can secure for themselves a sort of strategic position and acquire a degree of advantage over their most direct competitors. It is always on the global ground of each State's bourgeois interests that the selection of alliances between imperialists take shape, in an unceasing chain of manifest or concealed actions, where there is certainly no lack of "blows beneath the belt" and there will be no lack of "ideological varnishing", from which a moral justification will emerge for peace or for war, to be tossed to numbed and helpless public opinion.

Recent statistics have confirmed the slump in world commerce and the stagnation of production in the world's leading economic centres, apart from China, which [SARS notwithstanding! NdR: The article was written before the break-out of the SARS epidemic] is pursuing its march forward in the inter-imperial hierarchy and now loudly demanding a place at table when the booty is shared out. Moreover all the metropolises of world capitalism – including China – are struggling with an internal or foreign debt on the point of exploding, since the debt (internal or foreign, or, as for the USA, both of these) has been the lever that has allowed world economy to be drugged over the past few decades, to allow capital to be exploited to its full potential and, thus, to increment production for production's sake (profit), which is the aim of

the capitalist mode of production.

In the age of imperialism – a superstructure of capitalism and the direct continuation of it – the laws governing the operation and development of capitalism do not cease to apply, just like the contradictions that accompany this development, undermining the basis and very existence of bourgeois economy and dominion and revealing at every turn its transitory nature on a historical scale. Thus the central concentration of capital and the prevalence of financial capital accentuate the contrasts between states instead of alleviating them, since they demand more urgent intervention by the State in order to defend bourgeois dominance both within national borders and abroad, also in terms of competition between the different and opposing interests of other bourgeois States.

The development of historical processes does not admit any voluntarism and the "protagonists" of world politics are none other than the form, or the physical and personal representations, by which certain class instances or necessities manifest themselves and gain ground – in our own specific case, those of the ruling, bourgeois class. The crisis which has been in a chronic phase of ups and downs since the mid-Seventies, when the long, post-war cycle of expansion came to an end and the firmly established hierarchy of the dollar-standard and the US role as leading world creditor was interrupted at an international level, has obliged all bourgeois States to become more determined and aggressive in the defence of their own space and their own interests on the world market. Slowly but irreversibly, the necessity is advancing of adjusting the political superstructure of relations between the imperialist States (still conditioned by the balance of power of the late post-war period) to the new economic basis that has formed over the course of the last half-century. In other words, according to a process that is neither mechanical nor linear, the movements in world economic structure determine the imperialist demand for a new division of the planet: the significant redistribution of the plus-value produced by the international working class, to be more compatible with the new economic hierarchy and with the new relative balance of power, the manifestation of capitalism's unequal development. The signs of this upset balance in the relationships amongst States are the economic, monetary and financial crises that have succeeded one another and interacted, as well as the political and diplomatic contrasts and wars, up until now territorially limited but nevertheless bearing a global significance as regards

the balance of power and inter-State relations. In this context, the military ground is merely a concentration and synthesis of this pattern: it can never be considered and evaluated in isolation, outside its relationship to the politics and economy of every capitalist State. Today the USA insists on the war against Iraq because it must urgently realise the remaining capital of its absolute military supremacy (in the past 50 years the American defence budget has been, on average, 50% higher than the European one and the present military budget of the USA ranks higher than the sum total of budgets for the next ten countries in the list). This military supremacy is increasingly divorced from absolute economic supremacy: the American share of world production has in fact sunk from 50 to around 20% and the USA at present holds the highest international debt with a trade deficit that is now over 400 billion dollars (whilst the dollar's role in international usury is undermined by the decreased competitiveness of American goods and the introduction of the euro).

The American sense of urgency is fully shared by their faithful British ally, a purely parasitic and "rentier" power, whose foreign policy is dictated by the demands of the pound sterling, by the City and the multinational oil companies. England's presence in the EU – a shapeless federalist mess destined in the long term to pay the price of its lack of political centralisation (which cannot, however, be substituted for, or drawn up, at the conference table without causing a violent rupture of the national balance in the member countries) – is increasingly proving to be a factor that conditions Franco-German attempts to break free of America's tutelage, conditioning which tends to become suffocating, following the extension of the NATO and the EU itself to countries like Hungary, Poland and Romania, effectively channelled into the mechanism of American military and financial control.

French and German opposition to unilateral action by the USA is dictated by their fear of not being able to gain sufficient control over the post-war situation: their European Convention project appears as a preventive act to avoid total subordination to US foreign policy by means of the "new" Europe, which has grown, despite them, to the point of being too strongly influenced by American directives.

The guidelines of recent American doctrine on national security confirm how American imperialism is obliged to anticipate the moves both of its competitors

on the Asian (China, Japan) or European (France, Germany) scenes, who are making moves to question the American order of things, and of regional powers, such as India, Iran or Russia, who aspire to a more profitable position in the business of international piracy. The explicit declaration by the USA of a possible "preventive war" to support and defend its own national interests on the world chessboard, a war to be waged "alone" or with "occasional" and "varying" alliances (i.e. dictated ad hoc by various joint business interests) sums up a necessity dictated by the requirements of strategic control through which the USA endeavours to react, insisting on its own power policy, to its relative economic and financial – and hence structural – decline. For the logistics of the "preventive war" it becomes of fundamental importance to win stable military positions and bases, to set up a system able to render the military potential for projecting the power of rapid-intervention forces effective, since territories also have to be defended against the possible return of enemies or the growing appetite of allies. Following the 1991 Gulf War, the war in the Balkans and the war in Afghanistan, the USA has obtained the result of planting in Eurasian territory the scaffolding for a military set up consisting of strategic bases (the last of which, after those obtained in Central Asia, is a base in Qatar, negotiated for a twenty-year period and to be used as the headquarters for operations in the Gulf area). Thanks to this set up, American imperialism has almost surrounded China (which they are pressing to become an ally and on which they are counting for a favourable outcome to the process of Korean unification) and has brought Russia round to a more moderate line (since Russia has had to give up its monopoly on the transit and distribution of resources coming from the Caspian area and, with this, any remaining, independent claims as a global power) – all this as an anti-German move. As we have repeatedly demonstrated in our press, the strategic control of the oil-producing areas in Asia and the Middle East has been the operational priority of the American administration since Carter, i.e. since the turning point of the mid-Seventies, with a clear continuity of positions, quite apart from the political colours of the president in office. For the USA, preventing the emergence of new contenders and limiting the access of the ex-USSR were side effects of the same logic according to which the geopolitics of energy are subordinate to the general necessities imposed by command over the share of the world's plus-value that every national bourgeoisie attempts to defend or to turn to its own advantage in the "space" of the world market.

For Marxism, all the politics of the ruling classes, whatever the ground on which they are carried out or whatever form they are pursued under, have a significance totally determined by and functional to the widespread reproduction of the relations of production, on the basis of which these politics cannot fail to arise and to develop. All this also applies to open military action, since war is one of the means by which capitalist imperialism reproduces itself and perpetuates the basic conditions for the primacy of financial capital and social parasitism. What is really at stake today in the totally bourgeois confrontation over the war in Iraq is the post-war situation in the Gulf with its new equilibrium and the consequences for control over the flow of energy. The disarming of Iraq, the UN inspectors' reports and UN deliberations are all fig leaves by means of which "pacifists" and "interventionists" now defend, from different sides and out of opposing interests, their "right" to interfere and divide out the booty – in the name of which they may well be dispatching troops tomorrow (as France is today in the Ivory Coast) or become the supporters of talks (as the USA with North Korea). The proletariat can expect nothing from adhering to one or the other bourgeois camp, except the prolonging and aggravation of its captive state and subordination to the enemy class and to the latter's plans for social conservation, regardless of whether this waves the flag of European neo-chauvinism or that of the abject and hypocritical morality of the stars and stripes. To the infamy of imperialist war or peace, the world proletariat can and must oppose none other than the unyielding defence of its own living and working conditions and the future of the Species, refusing to be recruited in any way to support war or peace in the ranks of the bourgeoisie and tirelessly giving priority to the attack on its own bourgeois class – fighting in the context of its class Party to prepare the conditions for overthrowing capitalism – the only way to put an end to the true causes of imperialist wars, which lie at the heart of capitalism itself.

The International Communist Party (ICP)

***Pacifism in all forms  
opens up the way  
to imperialist war***

**REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM  
IS THE ONLY ANSWER**

Several times in our press we have examined the reasons for this new American (and English, and...) attack in the area reaching from the Balkans to Central Asia through the Middle East, as well as the constant diplomatic tug-of-war or lack of it. Here, we are interested in dealing with the responses towards which a movement that truly wishes to stop the imperialist war should be moving.

First of all, we stress: "imperialist war". That is, a war whose roots are to be found in the irremediable contrasts typical of the culminating phase of capitalist development – the phase where this mode of production reaches the peak of its destructive potential and putrefaction, where competition and the extortion of plus value become frenetic, where control over sources of raw materials and sharing out of the markets become essential, especially in a time of crisis like the present. It is a war that follows a pattern determined by material laws: in the very same way that development of capitalism into imperialism is determined by material laws – a pattern which the Communist movement (as an economic and social science) has known perfectly for a hundred and fifty years.

This imperialist war pacifists would like to oppose: both lay pacifists belonging to the area including (with some different shades of meaning or perplexities) the greens, the 'Ulivo' (party of the Olive Tree), supporters of old-time Stalinists (Rifondazione Comunista) and a variegated range of disobedient non-globals (in a word – and looking beyond the borders of miserable... 'Little Italy' – a strongly diluted form of social democracy), as well as the religious pacifists, from His Holiness the Pope to various different churches and denominations, grass-root communities, street-worker priests and whoever else you can think of. All of them animated by strong moral indignation: war hurts, brings suffering and destruction, does not serve to smooth out differences but creates new ones, etc. etc..

How can we possibly deny it? The fact is that for all of these people, according to a convergence of opinion that is becoming more evident day by day, the "war" is, on the one hand, a sort of metaphysical evil and, on the other, the product of the egoism and obstinacy of individuals, of one powerful and heartless

man or another (perhaps with a personal interest in certain raw materials, certain sources of minerals or oil). For them, the enemy is not a mode of production which – after representing an initial step ahead for the human species and saving it from the obscurity and historical backwardness of feudalism – exhausted its positive and propulsive phase long ago and is now agonising with all the disastrous and inauspicious effects of an agony that is being prolonged beyond all limits. No, the enemy is one villain or another, some personification of metaphysical evil or another. Who should finally be replaced, through a vast movement of opinion and indignation, by good guys, entrusting the safeguarding and monitoring of all this to the eagle eye of international organisms, some of which already exist (the UNO, the NGO network, democratic channels of participation, certain 'friendly' governments, the 'movement of movements', Porto Alegre as a happy oasis, etc.), and some of which have yet to be created (from the grassroots, by a general spread of conscience that would pervade people, groups and parties with its moral principles: in a word - evangelisation).

In the midst of all this, is there any talk of "mode of production"? of "economic laws"? of "imperialism"? of "class"? of "states" as the tools used by a ruling class to detain power? Please! Things of the past, covered in mould, best forgotten! Viva Jesus Christ, viva Saint Francis, viva Tolstoy, viva Don Ciccio, viva subcomandante Marcos, and Naomi Klein (and now viva Lula and Chavez, too)! They (and others yet to come) will be entrusted with the mission of restoring morality to history, after Bush, Blair and all the other baddies have trampled it underfoot out of mere personal interest and extreme greed. The fact that this way of thinking (this most banal project of universal pacifism) is identical to that of Enemy Number One (on one side the goodies, on the other the baddies: the really good goodies, the really bad baddies) does not concern these people in the least, lost as they are in a sea of molasses, priestly rhetoric and fine sentiments.

How, then, can the war be stopped? By rings-of-roses, rainbow flags on balconies, big folk festivities in the "south of the world", appeals and petitions by famous people, a piece of white cloth tied to your arm or your bag, a bunch of leaflets thrown into the chamber of Parliament, round tables with panels of experts and speeches on television, and so on. All that can be expected of a body of opinion is to bring into operation that vague, impalpable and fleeting essence that constitutes "conscience"; all that can be expected of a purely moral stance is thumping of chests, falling to

the ground with your eyes shut. Is all this enough to stop an imperialist war? And supposing there were to be another clamorous "attack", perhaps at the heart of "pacifist" old Europe, where would all these fine souls stand? Historically, pacifism has always proved to be quite ready to side with warfare, once...the appropriate conditions have matured (there is no lack of examples, both in the First and in the Second World War) – to become acutely nationalist and chauvinist, when "the country is in danger". Wait and see...

But it is not just by its willingness to be transformed into warmongering that pacifism opens up the way for imperialist war. It does so in a far more subtle, deeper and more dangerous way. It does so (according to its very nature) by disarming - in the face of imperial war - all those (individuals, social groups, classes) that fall into the trap. It is theoretical, political and material disarmament. To forget and deny the economic origins of the impulse towards war that is inherent in capitalism, particularly in its imperialist phase, means disarming. To fuel any illusion of appeals to a sense of morality or cultivate confidence in organisms considered to be impartial (the UN!) means disarming. To lead people to believe that the problem lies in a few lurid individuals usurping a healthy, democratic (?) way of life, which should, instead, be revived and indeed strengthened, means disarming. We are no sorry Cassandras when we say that before very long we shall be witnessing the most 'amazing' pirouettes, the most 'surprising' of about-turns, when the knotty problems of pacifism in all its various forms have to be seriously and urgently disentangled. If it has not been sufficiently opposed, and in good time, it will, unfortunately, be too late. The work of disarmament will have progressed and put down roots and the way will be wide open for a new world massacre.

How, then, can we fight against the imperialist war (and at the same time neutralise the pacifism that opens up the way to it)? Firstly by recognising that it is indeed a question of an imperialist war, and thus rooted in a mode of production that possesses its own specific characteristics. Next, by fighting against this mode of production and its particular economic laws. But what does this mean? What are the implications and the strategic and tactical developments involved? The Communists' brief, when faced with imperialist wars, has always been revolutionary defeatism. This means refusing to side with any of the opposing fronts and open battle against the bourgeoisie in your own country. It is true that now, after more than seventy years of counter-revolution, during which Fascism,

Stalinism and democracy have given one another a hand in destroying the Communist programme, the memory of a tradition, the sense of certain concepts, it is difficult to launch a slogan like revolutionary defeatism. It feels like crying in the desert. Yet all the slogans of revolutionary Communists are projected towards the future, since they point both to an objective to be achieved and, at the same time, to the path that should be followed to achieve it. The time when a slogan like "revolutionary defeatism" will be able to mobilise and bring together the proletarian masses, carrying with them those who are tired of bleating and feel the urge to return to the fight, may seem to be a long way off. Yet this slogan encompasses a strategy which also regards our miserable present. Revolutionary defeatism today means refusing to conceive of the capitalist economy as the collective good, to be defended and supported. It means refusing to yield to the blackmail of sacrifice in favour of the national economy, or "donating your work to your country", which tomorrow becomes "donating your life to your country". It means refusing to sacrifice your own needs in terms of living and working conditions (higher pay, shorter working hours, employment, health protection inside and outside factories, medical care, pensions, housing, etc.) to the fluctuations of the national economy. It means refusing to limit, isolate, attenuate or suspend your own battles because of a "social pact", made necessary by the "critical period the country is going through". It means refusing to ban from prospective action terms like "indefinite general strike without warning, halting production, workers' pickets". It means refusing to think in terms of "nation" or "fatherland" and starting to think once more in terms of "class" and, above all, of "international class", gathering together to support the weaker and more easily blackmailed and exploited categories, those who are (beyond all rhetoric) true class brothers – the immigrants. It means starting to build up once more a network of organised relations from factory to factory, from one struggle to the next, from one category to the next, being well aware that in all this the official trade unions (which take the fate of the national economy so much to heart) will always represent not a natural ally but a true enemy. It means starting once again to side with a class to defend basic objectives (jobs, living and working conditions, the unchallenged use of strikes as a weapon). It means starting once more to reason in terms of revolutionary politics, a revolutionary party, real and tangible internationalism. These and no others are the preconditions, the first steps to take in the direction of revolutionary defeatism. They are already the begin-

nings of revolutionary defeatism. We are well aware that the road is a long and difficult one. It has to go through the phase of opposition to the state (which is not a neutral body but a tool for defending the interests of national capital), an arduous retrieval of concepts and habits lost in time, a break with the trade unions that have gone over to the other side of the barricades or whose practices and prospects are confused and contradictory, the worldwide reorganisation of the international Communist party, equipped with firm theory, a political programme that is not based on day-by-day improvisation, serious organisation - not one of heralds and wordmongers.

Yes: ours is a battle cry, the same that Communists have been shouting for a hundred and fifty years. Because that's what is needed; not bleating, whining, prayers and appeals.

The International Communist Party (ICP)

## **AGAINST THE IMPERIALIST WAR, PACIFISM OR REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM?**

As the use of words yields to the use of arms, a few concepts must be urgently re-stated:

- \* imperialist war is the inevitable consequence of contradictions that are all to be found within the capitalist mode of production grounded on competition, the market, the extraction of plus-value – in a word on everyone waging war on everyone else;
- \* in a deeply critical phase such as the one that began halfway through the '70s, the problem of raw materials (the control of areas rich in them and the routes along which they are moved) becomes of prime importance, so that all countries are affected by it, with no exceptions;
- \* the new US attack in the Gulf – following the one in 1991 and subsequent attacks in Kosovo and Afghanistan – corresponds exactly to this logic of control (and containment and exclusion of other countries just as interested but not yet in a strong enough economic or military position to challenge the strongman of imperialism);
- \* we must not talk in over-simplified terms about an 'oil war' (or cry scandal at the connections between some puppet or other and other some oil multinational or other) but about a clash between imperialist forces equally driven by the crisis, which is a prelude – when the time is ripe – to a new world war.

It is thus truer than ever that any reply to the prospect of imperialist war that fails to envisage the necessity of a fight (long and difficult) against this mode of production, against capitalism as an economic and social system, is not only destined to fail but itself becomes a tool (no matter how involuntary) of political disarming and disorientation, of illusion and frustration. It is not useless moralising, whining, praying, appeals, signatures, petitions, waving of rainbow flags and white rags, round tables and famous names that are needed, if we really want to fight the slide downwards, through major and minor clashes, leading (not because of the evil of individuals but determined by material, economic, conditions) to new, worldwide slaughter.

We need to return to a class and not an inter-class perspective, where the historical interests of the world's working class come first. This is the only social

force truly able - when guided by revolutionary Marxism - to put a spanner in the works of imperial warfare (the latest and acute expression of the same war that is waged every day in workplaces, amidst growing exploitation, the despair of endless migration, the misery of unemployment).

- \* Refuse all solidarity with the world's ruling class and thus first and foremost with your own bourgeoisie in whatever form it takes
- \* Refuse all support for "the superior needs of the country" with the excuse of "the exceptional circumstances" and refuse to sacrifice your own immediate interests (living and working conditions, wages, hours, pensions, medical care) to what become "the demands of the national economy"
- \* Refuse to side with any of the forces at war or to support the "pacifism" of one country or another or one political force or the other, the faces of national capital which are only playing for time because they are not yet ready to join the fight
- \* Proclaim an indefinite general strike without limits of time or space, as a means of blocking the war effort by your country's bourgeoisie and to show the true face of all those forces (political and trade unionist) that declare they are against war but in practice have the interests of the country's national economy at heart (and are thus preparing for war in the long term)
- \* No pacifism, no excuses, but revolutionary defeatism!

There is no other way to stop the imperialist war or to sabotage it when it is already spreading.

The International Communist Party (ICP)

**May Day 2003**

**“THERE IS NO WAR  
THAT BE NOT INFAMOUS,  
THERE IS NO PEACE  
THAT BE DESIRABLE,  
UNTIL THE REIGN OF CAPITAL LASTS”**

Workers! Proletarians! Comrades!

Today, as in the past, the world proletariat would not only have the right, but also the duty, to pull down the national flags flown at our demonstrations, on our day of celebration, by political and union leaders who have betrayed the workers' struggle everywhere and prevent class reorganisation. Once again, as it lays whole continents to waste, the international bourgeoisie delegates to its national representatives the task of chaining the proletariat to one national interest or the other under the flag of the "fatherland". And whilst the international chancelleries squabble over the spoils of war, the only peace, guaranteed not by an agreement between States but by the dismal power that unions and "left-wing" parties still unfortunately exercise over the masses, is the infamous "social pact".

Never as clearly as now, perhaps, has the political and economic collapse of the bourgeois régime been so evident to the whole world. Economic crises follow one on the heels of the other, in production, in finance and on the world's Stock Exchanges. States which ranked amongst the rich countries ten years ago are being strangled in the grip of a dramatic recession, whose backlash will soon inevitably be felt by the western powers.

Whilst unemployment, under-employment, "black" labour, starvation wages and the now unsustainable cost of living are increasing the misery of millions of exploited people everywhere, the historical strongholds of capitalism, in America and Europe, are outliving their time. Governments of every political colour, "right-wing", "left-wing" and "centre", have, for decades now, been obliged by the laws of the capitalist relations of production to adopt the same measures everywhere against salaried workers and, beyond the streams of rhetoric on "peace", "freedom", "democracy", "human rights", to let loose wars, to fill the prisons with immigrants and to violate at every turn the rules that they themselves established

for themselves only the day before.

After half a century of imperialist "equilibrium", new systems of alliances are more or less timidly coming forward. These are not at all the consequences of "warmongering" attitudes on the one hand or "peaceful" attitudes on the other, as much of bourgeois propaganda would have us believe. In the imperialist age there is no "peaceful" State, no "democratic" bourgeoisie: there is the fight by financial capital, which penetrates into the pores of society, to overcome competitors, to win new markets. But, despite appearances, the old mole has continued to dig away at the contradictions of the bourgeois régime. What seemed to some naïve souls to be a monolithic and invincible "empire" like the Roman one only yesterday, is staggering under the pressure of underlying economic forces. These are smashing, a piece at a time, the system of political and economic agreements arising from the second world war. But the fall of the Roman empire, two thousand years ago, meant the dawn of a new mode of production, whilst the ruins of this one are merely a prelude to the third world war, unless the Communist revolution victoriously manages to anticipate it.

Today, whilst the imperialist vultures, reconciled to some extent after their recent arguments, will be running to Asia – headed by Russia and Europe – for the feast of "reconstruction" and the banquet of the concessions (at least the few contracts that have not already been allocated), we see the proof that the second Gulf war is just the last link in a chain of massacres that cannot be broken as long as capitalism survives.

For us international communists it is clear that only the overthrow of this cursed social régime will be able to ban war from our history. This means abandoning any disarming pacifist or reformist illusions and returning to the objectives and methods of the class struggles that have always been part of the proletarian tradition.

These are thus our tasks:

*Resume the class struggle.* Begin to defend anew, and vigorously, our living and working conditions, opposing the ruling class, their state and national and international capital, a battle front that does not recognise internal divisions based on age, place, nationality, gender, category, language or any other, and utiliz-

ing the most extensive and centralised struggles possible.

*Permanent organisation of the proletariat.* Work to recover organisms able to centralise, link and direct battles for economic defence, openly opposed to the sabotaging practices of the national unions and with a full understanding of the betrayal (to the full advantage of the bourgeois economy) by the central union organisations and opportunist parties and mini-parties.

*Refusal of any concession to the State and to the national economy.* Insist that the State is not an organism standing above class interests, "representing all citizens", but the centralised and armed body that, in each country, defends the power of capital against the threat of the overwhelming majority of the exploited, and that the national economy is not a resource that belongs to everyone and which everyone should therefore take to heart, but instead the sum of capitalist interests – those that oppress and exploit us in the factories, on the streets, at the market and in our homes, and in whose name we are invited to take the side of one warring government or another.

*General strike unlimited in time and space.* Recognise the necessity of opposing force with force – not with colourful torchlight processions and inconclusive gatherings but retrieving the general strike as an economic and political weapon and, by means of this, striking a blow at the most delicate point of capitalist organisation: the very source of profit – production; gathering together workers of all categories and from all regions so that they are able to experience their collective strength and make it felt once more, instead of the frustration deriving from isolation, fragmentation and passivity.

*Revolutionary defeatism.* Refuse to yield to the sovereign power of capital, openly proclaiming that the imperialist war will not have us, either as a tool of massacre (whether by means of the old traditional technologies or the new, sci-fi technologies), or as the victims designated for the next wars, openly breaking with the bourgeois State, no longer just at the economic level of work relations, but also politically and militarily. Not a single man or a single coin for imperialist wars: an open fight against our national bourgeoisie, be it Italian or American, German or French, Serb or Iraqi.

*Fraternisation amongst the soldiers belonging to the*

*warring armies.* Declare that the nature and aims of the proletariat are international and internationalist. Turn arms against the imperialist State, demonstrate the necessity of the international union of the proletariat, above and beyond imperialist groupings and fronts, against our common enemy: capital.

We know. This is a long and difficult route but there are no alternatives. Today, like yesterday and tomorrow, the internationalist communists are in position: side by side with the proletariat of all countries and against the wars of capital, in the hard, daily work of defending and disseminating the theory of Marxism and the international party – the two weapons that will finally allow us to attack the heavens and move from the pre-history to the history of humankind.

The International Communist Party (ICP)